

1-13-2000

Meeting Notes 2000-01-13 [Part B]

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact

Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 2000-01-13 [Part B] " (2000). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 293.

http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/293


This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

December 16, 1999

1999 Regional Transportation Plan

Public Comment Report

*Summary of comments received between
October 1, 1999 – December 16, 1999*



METRO
Regional Services
*Creating livable
communities*

Metro

Protecting the nature of our region

"It's better to plan for growth than ignore it."

Planning is Metro's top job. Metro provides a regional forum where cities, counties and citizens can resolve issues related to growth – things such as protecting streams and open spaces, transportation and land-use choices and increasing the region's recycling efforts. Open spaces, salmon runs and forests don't stop at city limits or county lines. Planning ahead for a healthy environment and stable economy supports livable communities now and protects the nature of our region for the future.

Metro serves 1.3 million people who live in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties and the 24 cities in the Portland metropolitan area. Metro provides transportation and land-use planning services and oversees regional garbage disposal and recycling and waste reduction programs.

Metro manages regional parks and greenspaces and the Oregon Zoo. It also oversees operation of the Oregon Convention Center, Civic Stadium, the Portland Center for the Performing Arts and the Portland Metropolitan Exposition (Expo) Center, all managed by the Metropolitan Exposition-Recreation Commission.

For more information about Metro or to schedule a speaker for a community group, call (503) 797-1510 (public affairs) or (503) 797-1540 (council).

Metro's web site: www.metro-region.org

Metro is governed by an executive officer, elected regionwide, and a seven-member council elected by districts. An auditor, also elected regionwide, reviews Metro's operations.

Executive Officer

Mike Burton

Auditor

Alexis Dow, CPA

Council

Presiding Officer

District 6

Rod Monroe

Deputy Presiding Officer

District 4

Susan McLain

District 1

Rod Park

District 2

Bill Atherton

District 3

Jon Kvistad

District 5

Ed Washington

District 7

David Bragdon

Regional Transportation Plan Public Comment Report

Introduction

This report provides a compilation of public comments received during the public comment period on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which began October 1, 1999 and ended December 16, 1999. Letters, e-mail, voice messages, and oral comments and testimony contained in this document were submitted by individuals, business owners and representatives, neighborhood groups, governments, agencies, and organizations as part of this comment period.

The RTP is a 20-year blueprint that establishes transportation policies for all forms of travel- motor vehicle, transit, pedestrian, bicycle and freight – and includes specific objectives, strategies and projects to guide local and regional implementation of each policy. The plan also comes with cost estimates and funding strategies to meet these costs. The plan was first adopted by the Metro Council in 1983, and is updated periodically to reflect changing conditions. The final draft of the 1999 Regional Transportation Plan is the culmination of more than four years of work to implement the Region 2040 plan and prepare for the expected growth in the region.

Summary

On October 1, 1999, the 60-day public comment period commenced for adoption of the RTP. Newspaper notice and a mailing to alert interested citizens to the opportunities for review and comment on the RTP were conducted in tandem with the release of the draft RTP. Support materials in the form of a newsletter and eight project factsheets, were designed to help the community more easily understand the enormous amount of information contained in the RTP. The project webpage, and transportation hotline also supplied update information and public informational opportunities for the RTP.

During this period, there was a series of public involvement opportunities related to the RTP update. More than 100 citizens participated in four regional public comment meetings that were held at the Conestoga Intermediate School on October 20, in Beaverton, at the Gresham City Hall on October 21, at the Metro Regional Center on October 26, and at the Monarch Hotel on October 28, in Clackamas County. The meeting format was designed to allow citizens to learn more and to provide oral and written comments on the RTP. A formal hearing before the Metro Council was held on December 2 where public testimony on the draft RTP was taken. The Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee met on December 16, to discuss the draft RTP and receive public comment. The Metro Council took public comment for a final time on December 16, 1999, before approving a draft RTP by resolution. The resolution will be followed by an ordinance that would enact the plan in spring of 2000.

More than 125 comments were received during this comment period. There is some duplication due to the fact that many people commented at hearings, as well as in writing. Also many sent e-mails and letters that contained variations on their previous comments.

The breadth of comments received during the public comment period reflects all facets of the RTP, including transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and motor vehicle improvements, freight movement and funding strategies. Comments ranged from support of, or request for removal of, specifically numbered projects from a particular subarea, to more global comments on policy matters, or on the totality of the RTP document itself.

In general comments were expressed for transportation solutions that provide access to and within communities by all modes of travel. Interest was expressed for improved bus service, commuter rail and light rail. Support was expressed for pedestrian and bike improvements, improvements to major intersections, and added highway capacity.

In this report, every effort has been made to include all comments received at the meetings and hearings held during the public comment period. This also includes comments received through the project hotline, e-mail, fax, mail or delivered in person during this time period. JPACT recommendations to the Metro Council on the comments received, as appropriate, will be contained under separate cover in Exhibit B to Resolution No. 99-2878B.

This report is divided into the following sections:

- I. RTP Meeting Transcripts - This section provides the meeting minutes for all comments received at the four regional meetings held in October 1999.
- II. Public Hearing Comments - This section contains the minutes for all comments received on the RTP, at the December 2, 1999, Metro Council hearing.
- III. Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee Meeting - This section provides the minutes for all comments received on the RTP at the December 7, 1999, meeting.
- IV. Metro Council Meeting - This section provides the minutes for all RTP comments received at the December 16, 1999, meeting.
- V. Regional Transportation Plan Public Surveys - This section contains surveys that were completed at the October RTP regional public meetings.
- VI. E-mail and written Comments - This section contains written comments received during the public comment period, which began October 1, and ended December 16, 1999.
- VII. Phone calls - This section lists phone calls received during the public comment period.

- VIII. Appendix – This section includes sample copies of public notices, advertisements, press clippings and other associated material.
- IX. Index – This section includes an alphabetized list of all citizens and organizations who commented, and the page(s) where their comments appear.

Table of Contents

Introduction		
I.	RTP Meeting Transcripts October 1999	1
II.	Public Hearing Comments December 2, 1999.	79
III.	Metro Council Transportation Planning Committee Meeting December 7, 1999	157
IV.	Metro Council Meeting December 16, 1999	167
V.	Regional Transportation Plan Public Surveys.	177
VI.	E-mail and written Comments	193
VII.	Phone Calls	397
VIII.	Appendix	399
IX.	Index	415

RTP Public Comment Report

I. RTP Meeting Transcripts

**RTP/STIP Public Comment Meeting
October 20, 1999
Beaverton Conestoga Middle School**

1. Don Waggoner, Leupold & Stevens, 14400 NW Green Brier Parkway, Beaverton, OR 97075 526-1404
Commenting on the RTP

Mr. Waggoner indicated that earlier this year his company discovered that there was a plan to run an over crossing across 143rd Ave. (RTP project #3187). As originally designed it would have come through the company's parking lot that was determined to be undeveloped area. Speaking in opposition to this current proposal which would take out significant amount of their property which they were planning on using for future development on both northerly and southerly property that was purchased several years ago with understanding that the area would be for their long term growth.

With last expansion they were required to close off Meadow Drive where it comes into the company's property. Employees were coming down Meadow Dr. going down to Walker. Agreed that this was a potential problem for people that lived on Meadow. Ok to connect to Greenbriar Parkway. If this proposal was to be carried out there would be extraordinary amount of people (10 to 20 times) that would make the average daily trip above current putting down there.

Reason this alignment being proposed is to get north south connectivity. The problem is that when you come down the hill and you hit Walker (Nike campus area) who won't be happy about traffic going on through their campus to get to Jenkins or further. This then fails as a North/South connector. Would be nice shortcut, however, from tennis center through 185th, Greenbriar Parkway, etc. producing significant way that Cornell Oaks works instead of serving a nice industrial park it would become arterial through the industrial park.

The proposed project does not significant help -less than 10% change in amount of traffic. In process it destroys a building, makes certain properties significantly less useful for the company, ruins a neighborhood and Greenbriar Parkway. AND costs about \$15 M.

Two parts of multi-modal activity that should be kept. Bicycle and pedestrian elements. Long term these elements should be connected underneath BPA lines creating a nice bike and walking path. To bring cars into area would be disruptive and produce no advantage.

Mr. Waggoner wants this project eliminated from the RTP. If in some future time that there is some major reason to revisit it, then reintroduce it.

Cedar Hill Town Center: This proposal originally was brought forward to help Town Center area and to unload Cornell. All studies show that there would be a zero change to Cornell yet this project still shows up.

2. Bob Behnke, Oregon Transportation Institute, 11895 SW Burnett Lane, Beaverton, OR 97008
Transportation Consultant - Commenting on the RTP

Mr. Behnke indicated that he had read through the RTP information. The brochure is pretty but it doesn't give the public full disclosure of the situation. In fairness to the public you need to qualify some things like "Public Transit Keeps Us Moving" (pg 14). Avg. weekday in 1998 approximately 186K riders used bus/rail system. By 2030 the number is expected to increase by 500K riders. Twenty years ago a similar plan was presented. Actual ridership today is much less than what was projected. The amount of public subsidy was forecast to drop, but in reality it hasn't. No relation to reality. Public deserves to know how good track record has been in the past. Urges that full disclosure be provided to public at least on the transit side. Need to tell the public how good the forecasts are for ridership & cost.

3. Dean Lookingbill, Regional Transportation Council, 1351 Officer's Row, Vancouver, WA 98661 360-397-6067
Commenting on the SSTIP.

Mr. Lookingbill indicated that he was speaking on behalf of City of Vancouver. He supports Delta Park project on the ODOT bond project list. I-5 is an important trade corridor from Vancouver through Portland. 1/3 of the Clark County labor force commutes to Portland for jobs. Supports I-5 trade corridor study. See letter of support submitted for this project.

4. Glenn Schneider: WSDOT, 4100 Main St., Vancouver, WA 98668
Program Manager and Acting Planning Manager for Washington State DOT. -
Commenting on the SSTIP

Mr. Schneider indicated his support for the I-5: Delta Park to Lombard project. WSDOT recognizes importance of the I-5 corridor. They are currently working in partnership with ODOT, Ports of Portland and Vancouver, Metro, SW Regional Transportation Council, Tri-Met, C-Tran, & FHWA to administer a trade corridor study addressing future capacity in the I-5 corridor from I-84 to I-205. Existing bottleneck at Delta Park to Lombard effects quality of life, reduces commute trip reliability to unacceptable levels. It is happening today and will happen in the future without improvements.

Portland & Vancouver are one metropolitan area with closely linked economic and transportation systems. WSDOT is committed to bi-state coordination. Projects in both states effect the other. One of the most frequent comments WSDOT hears from

their citizens is a desire to widen to three lanes the Delta Park to Lombard section on I-5.

Washington has bond program to fix some sites in their area. They are currently spending \$45M to widen I-5 to six lanes from Main Street to 99th in Vancouver. The Delta Park widening will remove the last remaining two-lane segment for traffic on I-5 from 99th St. in Vancouver to the Greeley/Banfield area near the Rose Quarter. Over the next 20 years congestion on I-5 will become intolerable unless other actions are taken. The Delta Park to Lombard project would be included in any package of projects in the corridor, it is relatively low cost, compared to other projects on the proposed list, it has no significant environmental impacts, and it can easily be accomplished in the six years.

5. Frank Angelo: 620 SW Main St, Suite 201, Portland, OR 97205 227-3664
Chairman Westside Economic Alliance Transportation Committee – Commenting on the SSTIP and the RTP.

SSTIP: Mr. Angelo indicated his support for projects listed in the packet. Priority projects for the Alliance are on Sunset Hwy and Hwy 217 corridor projects – the projects associated with the Westside Corridor Project. These projects should be the priority for the bonding money.

Noted that the I-5/217/Kruse Way Unit 2 project has been added to the list. This is a great project, however, in context of priority, the projects on the Sunset Westside Corridor projects are a higher priority than the Unit 2 of Kruse Way. If enough money to go around then that would be wonderful.

Was asked by Andy Cotugno to comment further on prioritization. Mr. Angelo said that all of US 26 projects are a priority for the Alliance, not just the two that have their environmental work completed.

RTP: Mr. Angelo said that he has not reviewed RTP to provide comment. He is waiting for the November draft to come out. Will do so later. Not ready to comment on 143rd project or any others including the Tualatin Valley Hwy project.

6. June Ferar: PO Box 25053, Portland, OR 97298
Citizen - Commenting on the RTP.

Ms. Ferar indicated that she lives in area bounded by Scholls Ferry, Beaverton/Hillsdale, Lauralwood/Jamison behind Jesuit HS. Feels that this area is being ignored in planning for the town centers particularly regarding Raleigh Hills town center. She is very concerned about an access road proposed for retirement center that has been built on Beaverton/Hillsdale Hwy (78th). Now the County wants to put a road through to Laurelwood which is two lane road with enough traffic already. She indicated that she is sorry that the County did not recognize need for access from retirement center, but the Laurelwood neighborhood does not to take the

hit for that decision in terms of congestion and danger on Lawurelwood. Intersection at Laurelwood to be upzoned into higher density which will increase problems.

Ms. Ferar said that when talking about the town centers and regional centers in the area there needs to be discussion about Scholls Ferry Road which connects all of these centers. There is no clear plan for Scholls Ferry Rd., which is currently a two lane road. No one is looking at what to do with all the traffic that is being proposed for the area and no one is looking at impacts. Tigard planning does not include it; County planning doesn't acknowledge it. Wants it in the record that people need to be talking about Scholls Ferry and the traffic impact. Two lanes where is all the traffic going to go. What's the thinking?? There are no bus services on Oleson Rd. All this impacts Laurelwood.

Raleigh Hills town center proposal has been poorly presented with no local participation. County has not stepped up—has not notified anyone. Business community represented, but no one from the residential community is on the advisory committee. Feels that the access to information is being restricted and that there are problems with the lack of communication by the County on the topic. Need to deal with ways to deal with congestion.

Ms. Ferar wants Metro to deal with the County on their behalf. She believes that her neighborhood has been deliberately left out of loop and that there has been a denial of due process. Hal Birdsma, proposed that a representative be appointed, but up to today no word.

7. Tom Garrett, 16477 NW Pumpkin Ridge Rd, North Plains, OR 97133 647-4742
Citizen – Commenting on the SSTIP

Mr. Garret indicated that he is interested in knowing what is happening at Jackson School Rd @ Sunset Hwy. This is a very dangerous intersection. There have been several projects out in the general area that completed to deal with back-ups. But nothing to fix this critical safety problem. If you cannot fix this area now, then the intersection should be closed. There will be some local resistance to this action. There is a project currently in the STIP but it is too far out. Thinks that ODOT needs to move this project up.

8. Terry Moore: 8440 SW Godwin Ct, Garden Home, OR 97223 244-3489
COP3 Neighborhood Association - Commenting on the SSTIP

Ms. Moor urged ODOT and JPACT to quit pouring money into freeways and funnel the money into town centers. She is looking for better community neighborhood redevelopment. If people see a better streetscape in the town centers, it may be possible to get them to accept higher densities. Frustration from the neighborhoods might be less if there were less a quid pro quo.

In response to questions, Ms. Moore went on to say that where state highways such as Barbur Blvd. run through neighborhoods they can be modified by using state hwy dollars to create main street developments. There would be a good partnership to get cities and counties to use some of their new money to help fund these modifications.

9. Cathy Stanton, 8595 SW Rebecca Lane, Beaverton, OR 97008
Councilor for Beaverton - Comments on the SSTIP and the RTP.

Councilor Stanton made the following points:

- From neighborhood point of view would like to see 125th extension (low priority).
- Hwy 217 is no longer a freeway – it is a highway. It has become an arterial street and that is okay. If you choose to increase capacity look to doing a toll lane as opposed to an HOV. ODOT can use the revenue. It will allow everyone who wants to use it to be able to.
- All of US 26 projects need to be done as well as I-5/Hwy 217 Kruse Way. Hwy 26 capacity improvements are needed to address cross town commute traffic is extensive.
- ODOT needs to better market themselves. Lots of people appreciate ODOT, but ODOT needs to sell itself.



October 20, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chairman ✓
Oregon Transportation Commission
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
Portland, OR 97204

Jon Kvistad, Councilor, Metro
Chair, JPACT
11595 SW North Dakota, No. 100
Portland, OR 97223

Dear Commissioner Hewitt and Councilor Kvistad:

Thank you for listening to the 50,000 plus Vancouver and Clark County residents who commute to Portland jobs each day. JPACT took a historic step forward when they agreed to leave the I-5 Delta Park widening project on the proposed list of projects for ODOT's \$600 million bond program. The Delta Park traffic congestion bottleneck is the most common transportation complaint I have heard since being in office. Until JPACT's action, funding had never been proposed, even though both Oregon and Washington have recognized the problem for over 20 years.

Our Vancouver and Portland region is the gateway and intermodal center for east-west trade with the Pacific Rim and is the second largest wholesale distribution center on the West Coast. I-5 is the primary economic lifeline for freight, business and commuters on the West Coast. This segment of I-5 from Vancouver to Portland provides access to deep-water shipping, up river barging, and two transcontinental rail lines. Interstate 5, in our region, is the key transportation corridor that provides access to trade-related jobs and housing. The problem is that I-5 is also the most congested segment of the regional freeway system in our Portland/Vancouver area. Without attention, the future level of traffic congestion on this transportation corridor will threaten the livability and economic vitality of our Portland/Vancouver region.

As mentioned earlier, one-third of our community's labor force, approximately 50,000 workers, commute to Oregon jobs every day. At the same time, trucks hauling "just in time" freight are trying to deliver their cargo to the ports and industries immediately north and south of the Columbia River. Both of these activities are critical to the bi-state region's economic vitality and both are negatively impacted by traffic congestion related to the Delta Park two-lane bottleneck.



Royce E. Pollard • Mayor
Rose F. Besserman • Councilmember
Dan Tonkovich • Councilmember
Pat Jollota • Councilmember

Jim Moeller • Councilmember
Jeanne Harris • Councilmember
Jack Burkman • Councilmember
Vernon E. Stoner • City Manager

Henry Hewitt and Jon Kvistad

Page 2

October 20, 1999

The proposed \$13 million dollar project would widen a small segment of I-5 south of Delta Park to Lombard Street to partially relieve a long-standing traffic congestion bottleneck on I-5 southbound and could be built in the six-year time frame.

Let me say one more time, the need to widen this segment on I-5 is the most common public comment I hear. I urge you to keep it on the funded list of projects for ODOT's \$600 million bond program and on Metro's constrained list of projects for the RTP.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. E. Pollard". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

ROYCE E. POLLARD

Mayor

Written comments for the RTP

You can send or call in
your testimony directly
to Metro:

Mail

Metro
RTP Comments
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Fax

(503) 797-1794

E-mail

arthurc@metro.dst.or.us

Phone

(503) 797-1900

Date OCT 1 20 1 1999

Name Richard A. Haley

Affiliation _____

Address 3536 S.E. 164th Ave.

City/state/ZIP Portland, Ore. 97236

Phone No. (503) 665-3944

E-mail address No

Comments 21.5. 26 From 82nd on to Gresham
is overly heavy with traffic. This
is project 2028. With only 1
lane each way, makes it very
dangerous for those in bicycle
lanes.

**RTP/SSTIP Public Comment Meeting
October 21, 1999
Gresham City Hall**

1. Rowena Hughes, PO Box 514, Troutdale, OR 97060 491-8067
Citizen - Commenting on the RTP.

Ms. Hughes indicated that she thinks Portland has made tremendous improvements in the post-War public transportation, especially with the construction of MAX. She believes that Portland still doesn't have the great public transportation system that was in place before the war had when people weren't so reliant on the automobile. She indicated her support of the old streetcar system.

She is a supporter of public transit. Her concern is for people who need transportation especially the elderly who have little options for mobility. Too many stops without benches, shelters, etc. People with limited incomes also have no other way to get around except by public transportation and sometimes the public transportation is limited in service to certain areas. Those buses that do run are too infrequent. She lives on 257th and the bus runs once an hour and not at all in the evenings and on the weekends. Would like better bus service by her house. Also suggested that there should be a think tank to develop ways to entice people to give up their cars and begin using public transportation.

2. Jim Galloway, 104 SE Kibling, Troutdale, OR 97060 655-5175
City of Troutdale - Commenting on the RTP.

Mr. Galloway indicated his support for project #2001 – the 242nd Connector from I-84 to Stark Street. He said that it is essential to provide the eventual connection between I-84 and US 26. He also said that is important for Troutdale to relieve congestion on the frontage road and 257th especially with the closure of Exit 16b on I-84.

Mr. Galloway also indicated his support for project #2123: Stark St from 257th to Troutdale Road. This project is a high priority in the City and County transportation plans. This section of road needs to be brought up to urban standards with appropriate widths and amenities such as sidewalks and bikelanes.

3. Charles Becker, 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham, OR 97030 618-2584
Mayor of Gresham - Commenting on the RTP and the SSTIP

Mayor Becker indicated his interest in two projects. The first is the project on Powell Boulevard – he said that there needs to be a reliable transportation route to fulfill the City's comprehensive plan. The second project of support is the 242nd Connector. He said that the bonding money should be made available to fund these long awaited projects. These projects have long been delayed and he doubts whether some of

projects can be built within 6 years. The 242nd Connector also support the City's transportation plan because they will make the transportation system efficient, without them the system will not be efficient. Finally, the Mayor indicated that the project will also help the movement of freight.

4. Gene Smith, PO Box 553, Sandy, OR 97055 668-0743
Member of Sandy City Council Commenting on the RTP and the SSTIP

Councilor Smith indicated that he was commenting on Project #4 the Clackamas Industrial Connector. He recommends consider changing the order of the Sunrise Corridor projects. Currently the SSTIP recommends constructing the section from I-205 to Rock Creek. The RTP calls this project #5003. While this area clearly has congestion problems, they are not as bad as the problems in the section from Rock Creek to US 26. The RTP project numbers for this section are #5004-5006. Fixing this bottleneck from Rock Creek to US 26 would move traffic faster. An astute driver can find a way around the congestion out to Rock Creek, but once you get to the bottom of the hill, there are absolutely no other alternative routes. While this may spur development out in this area, it will also give residents further to the east, such as in Sandy, better access to the industrial area in Clackamas.

5. Entered into record: City of Cornelius sent a letter requesting additional funds to complete the project that has been partially funded through the MTIP process. See attached letter.
6. John McConnaughey, WSDOT, 4200 Main St., Vancouver, WA 98668 360-905-2050
Commenting on the SSTIP

Mr. McConnaughey indicated his support for the Delta Park widening on I-5. He also said that he supports the Greeley-Banfield EIS and recommend earliest completion of the project. He recommends that the Greeley-Banfield construction project (#5) be kept on the list to retain flexibility if the Trade Corridor project reaches early conclusion there can be something from that study that can be constructed. He asked for some money to be available for an element of this project.

7. Paul Thalhofer, 104 SE Kibling, Troutdale, OR 97060 665-5175
Mayor of Troutdale. Commenting on the SSTIP

Mayor Thalhofer said that it bothers him that there is only one project in east Multnomah County, he feels that they always get the sort straw on just about everything that happens. He supports construction of the Troutdale interchange. It was scheduled several years ago, but ODOT ran out of money when they got to the 238th interchange. This project used to be high on the priority list, right after the 238th interchange. Why wasn't this project not even included on the list? The need is there. Why was it completely dropped out of sight.

The second project he supports is the widening of Powell Blvd. from I-205 to east to Hwy 26. Several people killed Mt. Hood Freeway project. Need more than one east/west highway. There can't be just I-84. It was needed. Should have been built and it wasn't. This has virtually strangled Gresham because of limited east/west freeway movements. Wants a mini-freeway or boulevard along Powell Blvd. from I-205 east to Mt. Hood Hwy. I-84 will eventually need to be widened and this will be very challenging.

8. Jim Worthington, 3232 SE 153rd, Portland OR 97236 760-2835
Citizen - Commenting on the RTP

Mr. Worthington said that he supports widening of Powell Blvd. through of Centennial neighborhood of Portland. He wants a minimum of left turn lane through out the area. Also supports I-205 @ Glisan in RTP. The right turn lanes are a good idea. Suggests resigning/stripping of the off-ramp so that cars turning left onto Glisan have their own lane, rather than being mixed in with cars that want to go straight ahead. Also, thinks that in this may need to be widened a bit to accommodate a right turn onto Glisan without holding others up.

Mr. Worthington indicated that he is concerned about pollution in Portland area. He thinks that there is a solution to help, but realizes that many won't agree with him. People in Washington County have to come through the City of Portland to go north to Seattle. He believes that all Washington County cars should avoid Portland – get them away from core Portland by sending them up to Longview Bridge or somewhere. He said he supports a Westside Bypass -- not necessarily the currently proposed alignment. Mr. Worthington also indicated his support of HOVlanes.



City of Cornelius
1355 N. Barlow Street
P.O. Box 608
Cornelius, Oregon 97113

Phone: 503/357-9112
FAX: 503/357-7775

RECEIVED
OCT 20 1999

October 15, 1999

BY:.....

Andy Cotugno
METRO
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland OR 97209

RE: Cornelius Gateway Enhancement Project


Dear Committee Member:

This letter is a request for your help and consideration in placing the Cornelius Gateway Enhancement Project on the list of projects to be financed through the ODOT \$600 million allocation under the 1999 gas tax funding.


We were very fortunate, as a small community, to have developed a partnership with ODOT Region 1 to submit a joint priorities 2000 application for a boulevard improvement called the Cornelius Gateway Enhancement Project. The project was only partially funded at \$1.8 million. The full project is \$4.541 million. This request is to place \$2.74 million in the ODOT allocation to complete this critical mainstreet project. This project is a great example for the Metro region in how a cooperative effort between Metro, ODOT and a small suburban community can work together to make the Metro planning goals work for the region.

We look forward to your support in this endeavor.

Sincerely,


John C. Greiner
City Manager

Sincerely,


Ralph Brown
Mayor

f:\mkg:99\cg\lr metro.doc

Cc Susan McLain, Metro Councilor
Mike Burton, Metro Executive Director
Kay Van Sickle, ODOT Region 1 Manager

**Written
Comments
for the RTP**

You can send or call in
your testimony directly
to Metro:

Mail

Metro
RTP Comments
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Fax

(503) 797-1794

E-mail

arthurc@metro.dst.or.us

Phone

(503) 797-1900

Date 10 / 21 / 99

Name SMILEY M. RAGAN

Affiliation _____

Address 4205 SE 102ND AV

City/state/ZIP PORTLAND OR 97266

Phone No. (503) 760-3967

E-mail address _____

Comments I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE EVER INCREASING
TRAFFIC ON POWELL BVD. THIS ROAD IS BASICALLY
THE SAME ROAD THAT WAS USED IN THE 1930'S, NEEDS
TO BE WIDEN TO AT LEAST 4 LANES & SIDEWALKS, FOR
SAFETY SAKE. PEDESTRIANS NOW HAVE TO COMPETE
WITH BIKES & CARS TO WALK ON SHOULDER.
THIS PROJECT #2028 WILL COST MORE EVERY YEAR
THAT IS DELAYED, SO IT ONLY MAKES SENSE BOTH
FINANCIALLY & SAFETY WISE TO START IT SOONER
THAN PROJECTED TIME OF 2006 - 2010

**RTP/STIP Public Comment Meeting
October 26, 1999
Metro Regional Center, Portland**

1. Lois Achenbach, 2005 NE 46th, Portland, OR 503-281-0063
Member of the RTP CAC – Commenting on the SSTIP

Ms. Achenbach turned in written comments regarding the Sandy modernization, 12th to 57th Avenue. She was supporting the project and is interested in creating a town center there.

2. Susie Lahsene, Transportation Program Manager, Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR 97208, 503-231-5000
Commenting on the SSTIP.

Ms. Lahsene shared a packet including letters from the Portland Air Cargo Assn. and Pacific NW International Trade Assn. regarding the Columbia Corridor project. See attached.

3. Paul Reed, Aeroground, Inc., 8904 NE Alderwood Rd., Bldg. E, Portland, OR 97220, 503-287-7407
Commenting on the SSTIP

Mr. Reed commented that the problem with Columbia and Killingsworth intersection is congestion. There are also safety issues. He felt it is one of the worst intersections around and there is no way to keep his loads time sensitive if he has to use those two streets.

4. Chuck Harrison, Halton Tractor Co., 4421 NE Columbia Blvd., Portland, OR 97218, 503-280-1540
Commenting on the SSTIP

Mr. Harrison turned in written comments regarding the bottlenecks and traffic backups on Columbia/Killingsworth intersection. He said people are starting to use alternate routes like Airport Way and Marine Dr. to get around the problem. He said the proposed layout through 87th is an excellent option and much better than the 60th street or others. It encourages traffic to use Killingsworth more with very little disruption to existing businesses.. He encouraged them to maintain funding for this critical project.

5. Per Fagereng, Brooklyn Neighborhood, SE Portland
Commenting on the RTP

Mr. Fagereng spoke about problems that would arise when the Grand street viaduct was closed for rebuilding work. He said traffic from the detour for that project would be complicated by train traffic and cause huge traffic backups. He said some thought needed to be put into that part of the project. Secondly, he talked about an Oregonian article from September 12 that said Westside MAX may be soon be maxed out. He felt commuter trains for outlying areas and points north and east would do away with the need for the Interstate line extension. He said commuter rail and streetcars would be a good way to deal with outlying areas and still have a rational plan for the central city using streetcars and/or buses.

6. Helen Farrens, Homestead Transportation Committee, 3956 SW Condor Ave,
Portland, OR 97201, 503-228-2740
Commenting on the SSITP

Ms. Farrens was advocating for finishing up the pedestrian way into Portland down Barbur. She said while they were putting in the roads and bike lanes they should continue with the pedestrian access also. She felt the Tri-Met plan for express buses in the plan was a great idea as long as they were local buses. She urged keeping the Barbur streetscape plan in the works and spending time on the connectivity parts of the plan.

7. Dave Hunt, For Congressman Brian Baird, 1220 Main St #360, Vancouver, WA
98660, 360-695-6292
Commenting on the SSIP

Mr. Hunt read and submitted a letter from Congressman Baird urging support of keeping the widening of I-5 between Delta Park and Lombard on the priority list as a significant demonstration of bi-state cooperation as well as a way of ending the congestion problem. He said they were excited about the I-5 corridor study as well.

Mr. Williams, panel member from ODOT, said there was no quarrel about the widening being necessary. He wondered whether they would actually lose momentum in the long run in getting a commitment from both sides of the river to do a long-term fix. He said in the short run they would see congestion improved but it would not last and that has made him nervous about the Delta Park area.

Mr. Hunt said from a practical standpoint it would help the issue but not solve it. He thought people would still see it was congested and future work was needed. He thought from a political standpoint it would be a boost in bi-state relations.

8. Peter Finley Fry, AICP Ph.D., 2153 SW Main, #104, Portland, OR 97205, 503-274-2744
Commenting on the SSTIP

Dr. Fry turned in written comments supporting the separation of the Water Avenue off-ramp from the Morrison Bridge off-ramp and make the traffic flow better onto

Water Avenue. He also suggested making the temporary signal ODOT had planned for that into a permanent one.

9. Don Baack, SW Neighborhoods, 6495 SW Burlingame Dr, Portland, OR 97201, 503-246-2088
Commenting on the SSTIP and the RTP

SSTIP: Mr. Baack has submitted written comments on the Southwest Portland study as it relates to the Naito Parkway. He's opposed to that. Barbur Boulevard modernization mainly is what he's here for. The neighborhood citizens have been highly involved in planning this and view it as extremely important. Barbur's becoming a sewer; the street doesn't attract the right kind of environment. There's little support in the southwest for any freeway project, but a lot of support for the Barbur project. Make sure you look at Barbur to the county line. The citizens want to see this corridor studied in these areas. Tri-Met would involve other areas as well.

RTP: Regarding Tri-Met, zoning and land use. The neighborhoods don't want to zone Barbur until it's looked at.

Access to I-5 is a key issue. Now it's Capitol Highway or nothing and that's a major neighborhood problem. When asked how to resolve this, Mr. Baack said possible overpasses and/or sign volume change. Fifty percent of the traffic goes onto I-5 from Barbur. Move it up the street? Get another entrance onto the freeway? A lot of Clackamas County traffic comes through here. The neighborhood told the Bureau of Planning to take Barbur off the table in the community plan because there's no agreement.

10. Kathleen (Kate) Griffith, 3411 NE 113th St., Vancouver, WA 98686, 360-573-3846
Commenting on the SSITP

Ms. Griffith spoke in support of Project 17. She felt lightrail should be a part of the regional plan and was disappointed that Clark County voted it down.

11. Penny Roth, 761 SW Vista #101, Portland, OR 97205, 503-224-6716
Commenting on the RTP

Ms. Roth commented that she is a full time Tri-Met rider and wanted to comment about how much she hates them and how inconvenient they are. The service is inconvenient and terrible. She said she is working on a list of reasons she does not like Tri-Met and the list is up to 59 items at this time. She lives on the 15 and sometimes takes the 8. She arrives late work not infrequently because of the busline. Slowness of the ride was a big issue as well as detours and other route problems. She said she was afraid for her life sometimes as a rider. She felt there needed to be improved public transportation and cars should not be the primary answer to getting somewhere. She said she had talked to Tri-Met about these issues also.

12. Terri Spaeth-Merrick, 1908 NE 50th Ave, Portland, OR 97213, 503-282-6228
Commenting on the SSTIP

Ms. Spaeth-Merrick spoke in support of keeping the Sandy Boulevard project on the list.

13. Sally McLarty, Bolton Neighborhood – West Linn, 21395 Willamette Dr., West Linn, OR 97068, 503-656-3795
Commenting about an ODOT project

Ms. McLarty commented about an ODOT project that was built in her neighborhood. Highway 43 west to the Elliot connection was the project and it was very disturbing to her neighborhood. They felt it was not workable. They felt very unlistened to and the consequences were sidewalks that went nowhere and the neighborhood was divided. They felt it was a boondoggle and a waste of taxpayer money. The livability has been lost in their neighborhood. The wrong streets were selected to connect to the arterial. The neighbors were made to feel if they protested the plan that someone else could use the money when they were asking for less, not more money for a smaller project that would have benefited the neighborhood.

14. Scott Bricker, BTA, Irvington NA, Lloyd TMA, 2938 NE 9th, Portland, OR 97212, 503-288-9493
Commenting about the SSITP

Mr. Bricker commented about accountability of the process. He said it seemed that when it came to giving out the dollars, things like bike lanes got cut out of their allocations. He said it was about providing a system for bikes to get anyplace in the Metro system because currently they could not.

15. Michael Kepche, WRNA, 39213 NE 289th St, Washougal, WA 98571, 360-837-3992
Commenting about the RTP

Mr. Kepche commented that he would like to see another bridge across the Columbia River and light rail to Vancouver. He also wanted to improve the rail lines from Seattle all the way south. He commented that there was a need for another rail bridge between the Port of Portland to the Port of Vancouver. He felt the bridge had been studied in 1983 that said it should go across from Sauvie Island to Vancouver Lake where there was a natural pass to the West Hills and Newberg.

16. Kay Durtschi, Portland, Or
Commenting about the SSITP

Ms. Durtschi commented on the Barbur Boulevard project. Her concern was that it had to be tied in with town center projects at the same time. She was concerned about the crossings there and thought they should be very careful about that. She felt this

project was not an immediate need but felt if the streetscape was done as planned they had to tie it in with a towncenter.

17. Mr. Lenny Anderson, private citizen and consultant, 2934 NE 27th Avenue, Portland, OR 97212, (503) 460-0211
Commenting about the SSTIP

Submitted and read written comments (see attached).

18. Wayne Kingsley, Co-chair, CEIC Transportation Committee, 110 SE Carruthers, Portland, OR 97214
Chris Hammond, Co-chair, CEIC Transportation Committee, 619 SE Division Place, Portland, OR 97202

Mr. Hammond:

Submitted written comments. Mr. Hammond said we are not commenting to support or condone any projects on the ODOT list. This panel helped shape the growth in our district, and yet of all the money available, none goes to the long-standing needs of the CEIC. It's difficult for us to compete with suburban construction parks when our needs continue to be overlooked.

Mr. Kingsley:

It's a mistake to combine these meetings. The RTP is a 20-year plan and deserves a process of its own; it shouldn't be thrown in with a hastily compiled list of projects, which may or may not happen.

The CEIC has developed projects over 20 years, which have been rejected. We'd like to request a meeting with JPACT to define and adjust so of our projects, some of which are preferred, some strategic, and also maybe explain some of them and their importance. The gist of what we're saying is why aren't any of ours funded? Some are pretty cheap. We just need an understanding of why we're not getting this done. The City of Portland is getting \$147.5 mill on STIP; we think some of ours should be done.

ODOT's putting in a temporary light as part of the Ross Island reconstruction. We tried to get them to do this as part of traffic mitigation but couldn't get them to do it.

We object to the turnover of recent highways because the Portland Department of Transportation (PDOT) is going one way and ODOT is going another. We don't think their objectives are compatible. We don't want pure in and out traffic; you do have to improve the livability of the neighborhoods.

The Water Avenue project is estimated at \$275,000 (less than 1% of the \$147.5 million). Regarding paying for it themselves, Mr. Kingsley said they've talked with PDOT regarding PDC funds to go in for part of it, and have also researched LIDs. He

said so much of the money goes into beautification – are we in the beautification business or the transportation business? Are the main street areas going to LIDs?

19. Gene Gyes, Coliseum Ford – Day Commuter, 4711 NE 47th Street, Vancouver, WA 98661, (360) 694-3637, (503) 288-5211
Commenting about the SSITP

Mr. Gyes indicated that he was speaking as a commuter. He is a Washington resident but has paid Oregon taxes for years. He supports on Project #17, I-5 (Delta Park to Lombard). The STIP quote, “one of the most congested segments” is putting it mildly. It is so bad of a bottleneck that the EPA could get after you for creating so much pollution. Give it some good priority, my personal viewpoint. Spent many a day taking an hour to get from Vancouver to Portland. Much money has been spent east and west, going to I-205 is great, even the truckers should be here . . . it makes their deliveries late, costs them more fuel, etc. You should try to speed it up to normal; six lanes going into a few, then opening back to six is really bad.

The in-bound HOV should be done away with. There’s a trickle of cars in it, and the other lanes are stop and go. Make one more lane, then you’d have more lanes for more people to use. If you make the other lanes suffer for a less used lane, it’s wrong. What percent drive in the HOV compared to the other two? (Andy Cotugno said a lane capacity is about 2000; we’re carrying 1200 in the HOV. Per hour in rush hour. You can’t fit more than 2000 per hour in one of those lanes.) If the extra lane were available for all citizens, we’d come closer to the speed limit. (There was a short discussion on the future possibility of reversible lanes.)

20. Kenneth McFarling, 7417 SE 20th Ave, Portland OR 97202-6213
Commenting about the RTP

Submitted written testimony, which he read. He also commented that our primary maps should reflect the other modes of transportation.

Mr. McFarling said that, years ago, the people who had invested in transportation found out that it was cheaper to use public roads than to put their own money into better railroads. This led to a discussion of how roads are funded as well other modes of transportation.

Councilor Kvistad said ODOT has taken ownership of some rail lines, and they’re looking at rail commuting; there may be some very positive things with this. Mr. McFarling agreed that ODOT’s rail division seems to have a heads up on that, but the legislature rejected sufficient appropriation to buy equipment.

21. Art Lewellan, SE Brooklyn at 8th St, Portland
Commenting about ODOT and the RTP

ODOT: Doesn't like the work he sees coming from ODOT, particularly from his side of town – the work proposed for the Ross Island bridge, the viaduct on the McLoughlin Corridor. Mr. Lewellan said many times he's made comments about that work.

Overall Transportation Planning cannot just include moving cars and trucks. Walking, biking, mass transit are all forms of transportation. If we only adequately fund statewide cars and roads, ODOT is acting as the department for cars and road. As such, when you add bike lanes, improvements to sidewalks, Metro is doing better work than ODOT. We are not going to be able to drive around like ODOT is planning to do because the electric car is going to be here. We need to reduce the amount of driving. Use energy less.

RTP: He was sorry to see in the RTP that the same South/North light rail plan is in there that the voters rejected. Doesn't believe it's going to do the job. We should do a South/North light rail, he always supported a particular route that would be affordable – put it on I-205 to Vancouver Mall, then connect to downtown Vancouver. To do the distance on the bus just doesn't get it. He can enjoy twice as many miles on light rail.

Barbur should have light rail on it. That's the one that's missing a good transportation improvement.

We can accomplish more with land use, with cities that are more walkable, where the transit works, and you can bike. Metro's position is very, very good on this. That's the way the country's going to go. Make all the transportation systems work. All of them.

22. John McConnaughey, WSDOT – Southwest Region, 4200 Main Street, Vancouver, WA 98668, (360) 905-2050
Commenting on the SSTIP:

Mr. McConnaughey presented the written testimony of Mr. Donald R. Wagner, P.E. (below). Mr. McConnaughey repeated WSDOT's strong interest in widening I-5 at Delta Park. Fixing Delta Park is the most frequent comment WSDOT hears. Washington has a \$150 million project to widen Vancouver's Main Street.

Other comments supporting Project #5 (I-5: Greeley – N. Banfield/Lloyd District Rose Quarter Access).

In the last paragraph of Mr. Wagner's comments, the I-5 Trade Corridor study is not on the list for comment, but WSDOT believes it would be important for both Oregon

and Washington to continue funding this in order to complete all the various planning and environmental work prior to the next federal funding legislation. We are jointly funding a variety of things with Oregon.

23. Written testimony: Donald R. Wagner, P.E., Regional Administrator, Washington State Department of Transportation, Southwest Region, 4200 Main Street, P. O. Box 1709, Vancouver, WA 98666-2709
Commenting on the SSITP

Mr. Wagner's written testimony regarding the STIP was submitted by . WSDOT strongly supports Project #17, I-5 (Delta Park to Lombard). WSDOT recognized the extreme importance of the I-5 Corridor to the movement of goods and people in the region. They also advocate Project #5 (I-5: Greeley – N. Banfield/Lloyd District Rose Quarter Access), regretting that ODOT and JPACT believe it cannot be constructed in six year. Because of this, WSDOT urges selection and earliest completion of Project #13 (I-5: Greeley – I-84/Lloyd District Access). Although funding for completion of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study was not included on the project list, WSDOT recommends that ODOT program funds to continue this planning study. (See written testimony for further details.)

Comment on Projects and Funding for RTP and on Projects for Funding through the Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement Prog.

Metro, Tuesday, October 26, 1999

My comments concern Sandy Modernization (12th to 57th Ave.): Reconstruct Sandy to Main Street design guidelines. Full scope includes 4 RTP projects. Would include transfer of jurisdiction to the City of Portland. It is buildable in 6 years, has a strategic RTP status of 2000-2010, and a projected cost of \$20,000,000.

Having been publicly involved in transportation issues regarding the Hollywood District since 1991, I can testify that most conversations about this area have ended with the difficulty of creating a real town center while the heart is split by a state highway. ODOT is focussed on moving the maximum amount of traffic through Hollywood at the highest speed possible. Hollywood area residents and businesses want people to be able to access the businesses without being directed in illogical ways or creating safety hazards for pedestrians and cyclists. By approving this project, Metro would be putting us a step closer to City of Portland control and more multi-modal friendliness.

Included in this project are signalized crosswalks, curb extensions, streetscape improvements at planned nodes along Sandy Boulevard, transit kiosks, Intelligent Transportation Systems, and selected street closures among other items. More detail is supplied in the Proposed Hollywood and Sandy Plan being presented to the Portland Planning Commission tonight.

Help us make Hollywood a real Town Center by healing the rift in its heart.

Lois Achenbach
2005 N. E. 46th Avenue
Portland, OR 97213
Telephone: 503-281-0063





P.A.C.A.
P.O. Box 55983
Portland, OR 97238-5983
(503) 735-3119 / Fax: (503) 735-1645

October 23, 1999

Jon Kvistad, Chair
 Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
 c/o Andy Cotugno
 METRO
 600 NE Grand Ave.
 Portland, OR 97232-2736

Henry Hewitt, Chair
 Oregon Transportation Commission
 c/o Kate Deane
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 123 NW Flanders
 Portland, OR 97209

*2k tracks, backed up traffic.
 like the alt. attached. Columbia Blvd.
 is moved out.*

Dear Councilor Kvistad, and Commissioner Henry Hewitt,

We would like to express our strong enthusiasm for constructing the E. Columbia/Killingsworth/ 87th Ave. connection with the ODOT bond program funds. The project is critical to maintaining good access to Columbia Blvd businesses and for industries exporting and importing goods throughout the region via airfreight. The E. Columbia/Killingsworth-Lombard connection is identified repeatedly as a transportation bottleneck that must be solved to keep goods moving on this system.

The current problem is acute. Traffic accessing I-205 from Columbia Blvd backs up over a mile during the afternoon peak. As a result, traffic from businesses on Columbia Blvd must seek alternative routes to access the freeway. Columbia Blvd. is a two lane facility that connects with I-205 through a signalized intersection at a rail road underpass. The intersection is very close to the I-205 interchange, limiting turning movements and constraining traffic flow. The proposed project, that you would help fund, would improve access from Columbia Blvd. to US 30 (Killingsworth) and I-205 through improved interchanges at 87th Ave. at Columbia and Killingsworth.

The Port of Portland, City of Portland and ODOT has completed studies of the problem to identify the best alternative for construction. A new connection at 87th Ave. best meets freight traffic and multi-modal objectives.

The Columbia Corridor has distinctive needs and transportation issues based on its business/industrial uses, and its function as a gateway for trade to national and international trade. These uses rely heavily on efficient freight accessibility and mobility.

PACA - Columbia Blvd - East End Connector**Page 2**

Our business is serving the air cargo market demand of this region. Air Cargo activity is highly dependent upon the landside transportation system for good access to shippers, freight forwarders, reload facilities and the air cargo terminals. The majority of the region's air related facilities are located in the Columbia Corridor and rely heavily on Columbia Blvd and I-205.

Addressing the needs of this area through strategic investments in transportation infrastructure is critical to maintaining the "economic engine", the role the Columbia Corridor serves for the city, the metropolitan region and the state.


We appreciate your consideration of this important project.

Sincerely,



Tim Dickhaus
President - Portland Air Cargo Association

cc: City of Portland Commissioner Charlie Hales,
Port of Portland Mike Thorne



One World Trade Center
121 S.W. Salmon Street, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon 97204 USA
503 471-1399 Fax: 503 675-9068

Pacific Northwest International Trade Association

Tuesday, October 19, 1999

Jon Kvistad, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
C/O Andy Cotuno
Metro
600 NE. Grand
Portland, Or 97232-2736

Dear Chairman Kvistad:

On behalf of the members of the Pacific Northwest International Trade Association (PNITA)¹, I am writing regarding the critical importance of a modern, efficient transportation system to support the economic growth of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest region.

Trade has historically played a significant role in development and growth of this state. International trade is 18 percent of our gross state product and is the fastest growing segment of this state's economy. The Portland area is the gateway for business access to national and international markets. It is the 10th largest exporting region in the nation even though it is the 26th largest population center.

Distribution of freight has been a strategic advantage for this region. The close proximity of two class 1 rail carriers with north/south and east interstate freeway access and our river and international air system has provided a strong foundation for the region and state's economic base. Further deterioration of the transportation system for moving products to market puts our economy at risk.

The Columbia/Killingsworth/87nd Avenue. Connection Project on the ODOT Bond program list is a project critical to facilitate trade in this region. The project is vital to maintaining good access to Columbia Blvd businesses and for industries exporting and importing goods through out the region via air freight. Studies analyzing efficient freight movement in the area, such as the Columbia Blvd. Study and the Airport Area Transportation Analysis, have been completed and the Columbia/Killingsworth at I-205 is identified repeatedly as a transportation bottleneck that must be solved to keep goods moving on the system.

The Columbia/Killingsworth /87nd Connection Project will improve traffic access from Columbia Blvd. to I-205. Traffic accessing I-205 from Columbia Blvd. backs up over a

¹ PNITA is a membership organization with over 200 company and individual members, founded in 1982 who are dedicated to promoting international trade.

mile during the P.M. peak. As a result, traffic from businesses on Columbia Blvd. (including most air cargo businesses) have to seek an alternative route to the freeway. Columbia Blvd. is a two lane facility connecting with US 30 Bypass through an intersection at a rail road overpass. The intersection is very close to the I-205 interchange, limiting turning movements and constraining traffic flow. The improvements will improve access from Columbia Blvd. to US 30 Bypass and I-205 by improving the connection at 87th Ave.

The proposed improvement has been endorsed by the Pacific Northwest International Trade Association. We urge to fund this important project through the proposed ODOT bond program.

Sincerely,



Tom Zelenka, Chair
PNITA Transportation Committee


Bcc: Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland

East Columbia – Lombard Connector

Reconnaissance Study

Alternative Two: 87th Avenue Grade-Separated Connector (3B)

Combines the construction of a new connector, near 87th Avenue including new railroad underpass, with a grade-separated intersection at Killingsworth Street. This alternative would involve closing Columbia Boulevard to all eastbound traffic, east of 87th Avenue, all the way to the intersection with Killingsworth Street.



Advantages:

- Grade-separated intersection on Killingsworth increases capacity, reduces delay.
- Improved safety due to improved geometrics and increased sight distances.
- Higher capacity railroad underpass than existing on Columbia at 92nd Avenue, therefore providing much improved connectivity between Columbia Boulevard and Killingsworth Street.
- Eliminates the need for the existing Columbia / Killingsworth signal when existing underpass is converted to one-way, access from Killingsworth WB only.
- Improved LOS due to signal downgrading to pedestrian-only at Columbia / Killingsworth.
- Minimal traffic disruption with staged construction outside existing roadway.

Disadvantages:

- High-standard temporary railroad detour required for duration of construction.
- Entire acquisition of six privately owned tax lots; partial acquisition of one additional tax lot.
- High cost.
- Does not address congestion at I-205 ramp terminal signals.
- Close access to 87th Avenue south of Killingsworth.



The Halton Company

October 26, 1999

Mr. Henry Hewitt, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
C/o Kate Deane
ODOT
123 NW Flanders
Portland, Or 97209

Mr. John Kvistad, Chair
Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
C/o Andy Cotugno
METRO
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, Or 97232-2736

Dear Councilor Kvistad and Commissioner Hewitt:

The Halton Company would like to express our support for allocating State transportation bond program funds to construct the 87th Avenue connector at Columbia Blvd., Killingsworth and I-205. As a business that relies heavily on transportation and the need for efficient traffic flows, we believe that this project is critical to maintaining good access to the businesses in the Columbia Blvd. area. Numerous studies have shown that the construction of this project is the key piece in improving the East-West traffic flow and will yield the greatest result for the dollars spent.

Everyday experience provides the proof that this area is the worst traffic bottleneck for East-West vehicle flow. At peak hours, back ups of a mile are not uncommon on Columbia Blvd. and Killingsworth. Off peak back ups of ten minutes, or more, along Columbia Blvd. are also common. As a result of these back ups vehicles are using alternative routes to access the freeway or local neighborhoods. In some cases these alternative routes are Marine Drive or Airport Way. Other vehicles are utilizing residential streets south of Killingsworth rather than sitting through the back ups. It is our belief that the proposed improvements would eliminate many of these problems and act as a cornerstone project for improving the overall traffic flow in this key industrial area.

Portland
P.O. Box 3377
Portland, OR 97208
(503) 288-6411
Fax # (503) 281-9458
1-800-452-7676
www.haltonco.com

Salem
3850 Turner Rd., S.E.
Salem, OR 97302
(503) 364-0602
Fax # (503) 364-9527

The Dalles
1238 W. 2nd
The Dalles, OR 97058
(541) 296-4642
Fax # (541) 296-1733

Longview
1205 Baltimore
Longview, WA 98632
(360) 423-5760
Fax # (360) 423-5292

The Columbia Corridor is a very unique place in Oregon. It is the hub of local, national and international trade for Portland and the state of Oregon. The combination of river, ocean, rail and interstate routes make a properly functioning highway system essential for continued effective freight movements and long term growth in the area. Failure to fund this project can only lead a steadily increasing traffic bottleneck that will be a deterrent to business development and cost effective goods movement. Again, we strongly urge you to support the funding for Columbia/Killingsworth and I-205 upgrades.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chuck Harrison", with a stylized, flowing script.

Chuck Harrison
Facilities Manager

Cc: The Halton Company- Ted Halton Jr.
City of Portland Commissioner- Charlie Hales
Port of Portland- Mike Thorne

BRIAN BAIRD

THIRD DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE

WATER RESOURCES AND
ENVIRONMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

COAST GUARD AND MARITIME
SUBCOMMITTEE

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

SCIENCE COMMITTEE



Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-4703

October 26, 1999

DISTRICT OFFICES:

1220 MAIN STREET
SUITE 360
VANCOUVER, WA 98660
(360) 695-6292

606 COLUMBIA STREET NW
SUITE 220
OLYMPIA, WA 98501
(360) 352-9768

WASHINGTON, DC OFFICE:

1721 LONGWORTH HOB
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3536

web address: <http://www.house.gov/baird>
e-mail address: brian.baird@mail.house.gov

Dear ODOT and Metro Colleagues:

As the Congressional Representative for Southwest Washington and a member of the House Transportation Committee, I want to thank you for including \$13 million to widen Interstate 5 between Delta Park and Lombard Street in your proposed bond program list. I also want to urge you to keep this important project on your priority list. I regret that Congressional business requires me to be in Washington, D.C. today, because I would prefer to share these concerns with you in person.

As you may know, Washingtonians who work in Oregon pay \$139 Million annually in Oregon state income taxes, yet they receive virtually no direct benefit from these taxes. Oregon obviously doesn't provide services like education and health care to Washingtonians who work in Oregon, yet these income taxes continue to be collected. In addition to income taxes, Washingtonians also pay a significant portion of gasoline taxes in Oregon.

I urge you to make sure that a significant portion of the significant revenue collected each year from Washington commuters pays for transportation projects that will directly benefit commuters from Washington. I especially urge you to include the I-5 widening between Delta Park and Lombard Street in any priority list, because this project will help overcome a major congestion hurdle for commuters.

I am delighted that the Bi-State Transportation Committee has begun their work with such goodwill and cooperation. I was proud to successfully work to obtain \$2 million in federal funding for the I-5 corridor study, which will provide significant guidance to the Bi-State Committee and to transportation planners on both sides of our river. I am hopeful and confident that this major study will identify solutions that enhance our region's economic competitiveness through the provision of adequate transportation facilities to benefit constituents in Oregon and Washington.

Widening I-5 between Delta Park and Lombard Street in the near future would be a significant demonstration of bi-state cooperation. I strongly encourage you to retain this project on your priority list and help us all stay focused on the transportation solutions than bring our region together rather than those which pull us apart. Thank you very much for your consideration of the needs of my constituents.

Sincerely,

Brian Baird
Member of Congress

BB/dgh

October 26, 1999

Metro-RTP Comments
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

ODOT - Supplemental STIP Comments
123 NW Flanders
Portland, Oregon 97209

**RE: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
Supplemental State Improvement Program (SSIMP)**

Dear Sirs:

It is difficult to change a culture that is geared to constructing large dramatic projects. However, many significant improvements to the system can be made with little investments.

One such project is to separate Interstate 5's Water Avenue off-ramp from the Morrison Bridge off-ramp. This project is estimated to cost less than \$270,000 (less than .01 % of the SSTMP dedicated to just the Portland region. Map 1 describes the area. Map 2 describes the existing condition. Map 3 describes the improvement. Map 3 is the result of engineering by the Portland Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).


ODOT intends to construct a temporary signal at this location. ODOT engineers have agreed that a substantial part of the estimated \$150,000 (\$70,000) temporary work can become permanent (such as the coils in the pavement).

This improvement will:

- 1) Separate the weave at the end of the on ramp enhancing safety.
- 2) Improve the flow of vehicles improving safety and congestion on the freeway.
- 3) Provide pedestrians and bicyclists safe and direct access off and on the Morrison Bridge onto SE Water Avenue.
- 4) Provide safe pedestrian movement through a controlled intersection on Water Avenue.
- 5) Improve circulation on Water Avenue.

I can not see any reason why this should not be constructed now.


Sincerely,




Peter Finley Fry AICP Ph.D.

Attachments

Map 1



Map 2



Map 3

1-5

Water Ave Offramp

Morrison Bridge Offramp

22

⊗ stop sign

⊕ traffic light

Water Ave.

DEANE Kate H

From: Don Baack [donbaack@k-com.net]
Sent: Monday, October 25, 1999 12:19 PM
Subject: DEANE Kate H
Fwd: Opposition to STIP Project #12 South Portland Circulation Phase 1

>
> Date: Wed, 20 Oct 1999 11:47:15 -0700
> To: laurel@syseng.ci.portland.or.us, kate.h.deane@odot.state.or.us
> From: Don Baack
> Subject: Opposition to STIP Project #12 South Portland Circulation Phase 1
> Bcc: donbaack@k-com.net, gbridger@teleport.com, Risher.Wes@deq.state.or.us,
> molloye@jps.net

> Kate, in view of the email problems you have been having, please let me know
> if you have received this by 10/25. Don Baack

>
> Don Baack
> 6495 SW Burlingame Place
> Portland, OR 97201

>
> ODOT Supplemental STIP Comments
> 123 NW Flanders
> Portland, OR 97209

> For the Record

> RE: Opposition to Project Number 12 South Portland Circulation Phase 1

> I have read the project description presented on page 17 of Portland
> Metropolitan Area: Proposed Projects for the Supplemental STIP.

> As a member of the South Portland Circulation Study Citizen Advisory
> Committee, the project as presented does not represent the agreement which
> was reached at our last meeting. It is missing two vital aspects:

> 1. There was to be a direct link to the Ross Island Bridge from Front/Naito
> via either Grover or Woods to Kelly with a signal at the Kelly/Woods or
> Grover Intersection. This condition was agreed to by all parties and must
> be explicitly stated in the phase one project to be acceptable (in my
> opinion) to the greater southwest Portland population.

> 2. The use of the parking lanes for a second lane for peak hour inbound
> traffic in the morning and peak hour outbound traffic in the evening was to
> be implemented at the inception of the project. There was to be no
> question
> that this provision was mandatory, not a decision left to the local
> neighborhood or PDOT staff. I understand that other CTLH neighborhood
> members
> of the CAC who were not at the last meeting do not agree with this
> condition. Another meeting has been scheduled.

> In addition, there are to be 4 to 6 traffic lights along the length of the
> project.

> The Southwest Neighborhood Transportation Committee has voted to
> recommend to
> the SWNI board a motion to support the South Portland Circulation Study with
> these conditions, among others. If the removal of parking for the travel
> lane during peak periods in the direction of peak travel is not mandatory,
> then the committee asked that 2 travel lanes be provided. The SWNI board
> will consider this motion on October 27, 1999.

> In view of the inadequate description of the project scope, and the missing
> elements of the agreement, I ask that funding for this project not be

> included in the 600 million STIP list. If these elements, as stated above,
> can be included in the project description, I am in full support of the
> project.
>
> Don Baack
>
> CC Laurel Wentworth
>


Lenny Anderson
Transportation Options
lenny.anderson@inetarena.com

2934 N.E. 27th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97212
Tel: 503-460-0211

October 26, 1999

To: Metro Council and Oregon Department of Transportation

From: Lenny Anderson, Transportation Consultant



Subj: Regional Highway Priorities

In the 50s and 60s when most of Portland's freeway system was designed and built, little thought or expense was given to what we now call mitigation. Indeed, entire neighborhoods in what could have been the most desirable sections of the City, the eastbank of the Willamette, Goose Hollow, Albina Historic District and south Portland were sacrificed to speed suburban commuters to or through Downtown.

I believe that in much the same way as communities are now compensated in some fashion for the negative impacts of regional transportation projects, the transportation priorities of the region should reflect the need to undo or at least mitigate the damage that was done to numerous City neighborhoods in those earlier decades.

Beyond a general statement agreeing to such mitigation, I would ask you, the transportation decision makers, to specify that certain projects be pursued in such a way as to reclaim land, indeed whole communities, lost to previous construction. These should include but not be limited to the following:

- Rebuild I-5 between I-84 and Greeley below grade between NE Weidler and NE Oregon (Oregon Convention Center) with a complete cover between NE Broadway and NE Oregon. Reconnect the regular grid of the Lloyd District with the Rose Quarter, create open space between the Rose Garden and Oregon Convention Center, provide land for housing and allow the OCC to be reoriented toward the SW—toward the Willamette River and Downtown!
- Fund an initial I-405 cover project in the West End at the MAX line crossing. Provide close-in housing, mixed-used and office development along light-rail line.
- Commit to the reconstruction of the eastbank freeway as either a covered, below grade freeway or as a at grade "boulevard" with traffic signals to allow pedestrian access to an expanded Eastbank park between I-84 and the Morrison Bridge. Bring the increasingly valuable land adjacent to the eastbank of the Willamette River to its full potential.

These three initial measures cannot undo the loss suffered by individual neighborhoods or the City as a whole due to the freeway construction of the past, but it is a start. It will begin to bring the full potential value of this land onto the tax rolls, make for more living, working and commercial possibilities in these close in communities and reduce the need for expanded highway capacity.

Lenny Anderson
Transportation Options
lenny.anderson@inetarena.com

2934 N.E. 27th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97212
Tel: 503-460-0211

Solving transportation problems by NOT building more roads may sound radical, but it is precisely the strategy followed by this region in the 70s. Two freeways were NOT build, Mt. Hood (actually Kelly Butte) Freeway through inner SE and I-505 through inner NW; few would argue that these communities were adversely affected. Indeed some of the most dynamic growth of livable neighborhoods have occurred right where those freeways were to be built. Downtown an expressway was converted to a riverside park, a city square replaced a parking garage, MAX was built to the Eastside and so on. Was this a failure? Has Downtown Portland wilted as a result?

The lesson here is Don't Build It and They Will Come! Vitality will return to more neighborhoods, a park will blossom on both sides of our river, and the Lloyd District and Rose Quarter will merge into a truely happening place. Have the courage to help us make it happen.



CENTRAL EASTSIDE INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

Mail: P.O. Box 14251, Portland, OR 97293-0251 - Office: 516 S.E. Morrison, Ste. 221
Ph: (503) 232-1012 - Fax: (503) 232-1045

October 26, 1999

OFFICERS

President
Connie Hunt (2000)
East Bank Saloon

Vice President
Mike Bolliger (2000)
Bolliger & Sons

Treasurer
Jerry Griffin (2001)
Sanderson Safety Supply

Chairman of the Board
Dorothy Hall (2000)
Hall Tool Company

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 1999

Kelly Braun (2001)
Lorentz-Braun Construction

Worth Caldwell (2000)
Caldwell's Colonial Chapel

Michael Coe (1999)
Coe's Road One

Joanne Ferrero (1999)
R.J. Templeton Co.

Ken Johnson (1999)
Goodwill Industries

Wayne Kingsley (1999)
Portland Spirit

Rod McDowell (2001)
OMSI

Randy Miller (2001)
The Moore Company

David Nemarnik (2000)
Pacific Coast Fruit Co.

Peter Norman (2001)
U.S. Bank

Bob Rogers (1999)
Robert R. Rogers Co.

Jim Stark (2000)
Stark's Vacuum Sales/Service

Mark Teppola (2001)
National Builders Hardware

Rob Wehrley (2000)
Columbia Printing/Graphics

Will Wright (2000)
William S. Wright Assoc.

Executive Director
Patricia Fuller

Metro - RTP Comments
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

ODOT - Supplemental STIP Comments
123 NW Flanders
Portland, Oregon 97209

**Re: Regional Transportation Plan
Supplemental State Improvement Program**

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a mistake to combine public response to two important issues: the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Supplemental State Transportation Improvement Program (SSTIP) at the same group of meetings. The RTP is critically important for the long term health and vitality of our region. The SSTIP is a precipitous collection of projects in response to action by the State Legislature that is already subject to reversal by referendum.

The RTP deserves its own process without being eclipsed by the short term demands of communities.

Concerning the RTP, the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC) formally requests an opportunity to present its projects to the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee. We need to further define "preferred" versus "strategic" projects for our area with regard to METRO's Functional Plan, and we need to explain our projects more clearly, as they all seem to be arbitrarily rejected.

Inter-urban projects are complex and require close examination and refinements to address concerns raised by a variety of jurisdictions. This must be done in a thoughtful manner. Projects can not be rejected in entirety by one agency or another because the project, has a specific correctable flaw. Our projects have been rejected in their entirety because the agencies concerned have not taken the time or creative energy to address the complex design requirement of inner-city projects and arrive at a solution.

We must move away from a philosophy of constantly building new systems. We must begin to fix and improve the existing systems. Culture must change or our region will continue to expand without generating any real intensity of use.

Investment in this inner City industrial area results in redirecting the real estate market from urban sprawl to inner-city reinvestment by providing jobs and economic activities at the regions' center. Our businesses, for almost one hundred years, have provided employment stability for inner-city neighborhoods. They have projected Portland into regional, national,

and international markets and have provided much of the economic foundation for all the suburban employment areas.

Please find enclosed a refined list of transportation projects for the Central Eastside Industrial District (CEID). This list is the result of over twenty years of thoughtful planning and assessment of needs. The CEID is critical to the region.

A strategic approach to investment would build upon the partnership between ODOT, Portland, Multnomah County, Tri-Met, and METRO in the reconstruction of the Grand/MLK viaduct. Portland has placed \$147.5 million of projects on the SSTIP. Several projects which are not included should be included which would complement the viaduct project: the Grand/King couplet should be improved, Phase 4 of the East Marquam Interchange Project should be moved to construction, and a ramp should be built from south bound MLK to westbound Ross Island Bridge.

We support the majority of projects that are on the RTP in regard to our district with the following additions and deletions. Our projects are driven by the following principles;

- 1) Direct Southbound access from the CEID to southbound Interstate 5 and westbound to Highway 26.
- 2) The McLaughlin/Marquam connection is an important link between the southeast region and Interstate 5 and reduces congestion on our "main street" the Grand Avenue and/Martin Luther King Boulevard couplet.
- 3) Access from our district to the entire regional system must be improved.
- 4) The system through and to the CEID must be fixed and adjusted in specific ways to refine and maximize the system's efficiency.

ADDITIONS:

- A) Reconstruction of Hawthorn/Madison between SE 12th and Grand Avenue.
- B) Realignment of Hawthorne Bridge Ramp southbound to MLK to release Clay Street for access to OMSI and surrounding area.
- C) Creating a one-way couplet for Stark and Oak between Water Avenue and Grand Avenue.
- D) Separating the Morrison Bridge to Water Avenue from the Interstate 5 water Avenue off-ramp.
- E) Double spanning the Ross Island bridge for freight, cars, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- F) Central City street car extension over Hawthorne Bridge via Grand/MLK couplet to Broadway.

DELETION:

- A) SE 11th/12th Bikeway.

Concerning the Supplemental State Transportation Improvement Program (SSTIP) we have two fundamental concerns.

It is directed to construct massive projects that end up either being primarily suburban or "main streetasation" of regional traffic ways within Portland. The result of these approaches is to degrade access through and to the urban area and improving access in the fringe. This approach promotes urban sprawl.

Of Portland's \$147.5 million agenda, \$58 million is dedicated to "main street" regional traffic routes of which City expects to gain jurisdiction. We are concerned that the transfer of state highways to the City of Portland will result in the City redirecting the streets' purpose from an ODOT/METRO policy direction of regional access to a City policy direction of neighborhood livability. Neither approach is the correct approach. The tension between these policy demands should result in appropriate design. The inability of the agencies to cooperate is a sign of failure that should not lead to a rejection of principle. If the City gains exclusive control, then each "Main Street" will become politicized by "NIMBY" neighborhoods and the regional transportation system will implode resulting in degradation of access and capacity. "Livability" in terms of being able to get into, out of and through the city will be greatly reduced.

We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this hearing and meet with the various agencies. At this time we formally request and opportunity to redirect our improvement program back to inner-city reinvestment. The first step is for us to meet with TPACT.

Sincerely,

Wayne Kingsley
Co-chair
CEIC Transportation Committee

Chris Hammond
Co-chair
CEIC Transportation Committee



CENTRAL EASTSIDE INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Ph: (503) 224-3900 - Fax: (503) 223-6407

Co Chairmen
Chris Hammond
Hammond Construction

Wayne Kingsley
Portland Spirit

Member
Rod McDowell
OMSI

Consigliari
Peter Finley Fry, AICP, PHD
Columbia Pacific Planners

October 26, 1999

CEIC TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

- A. **Eastbank at Burnside Redevelopment Plan – Gateway to the Central City:**
 - 1. Develop plan for managing and increasing public and private parking to accommodate growth. This is a specific Eastbank requirement and also a general CEID objective.
 - 2. Traffic management.
 - a. Off peak left turn signals on E. Burnside Street at Grand and MLK.
 - b. Install signal at 7th Avenue and E. Burnside.
 - c. Fix E. Burnside Street/Sandy Boulevard/12th Avenue intersection; "Gateway to the Central City." Make it pedestrian friendly and more efficient for vehicles.
- B. **Improve Intra-District Circulation:**
 - 1. Improve SE Clay Street from Water Avenue to Grand Avenue.
 - 2. Improve SE Water Avenue from Stark Street to OMSI.
 - 3. Improve traffic signal operation on Clay at MLK and Grand Avenues.
 - 4. Install left turn lanes on Stark Street at MLK and Grand Avenues.
 - 5. Improve RR crossing at SE 11th Avenue and 12th Avenue at Clinton Street.
- C. **Improve I-5 and I-84 access to and from the district:**
 - 1. Preserve current auto/truck capacity on Morrison Bridge until Ross Island Bridge repairs and viaduct replacement are completed.
 - 2. Relocate Water Avenue off ramp from Morrison Bridge. Provide signals to control I-5 and Morrison Bridge off ramp traffic at Water Avenue.
 - 3. Direct MLK southbound and Grand northbound connections to and from Ross Island Bridge.
 - 4. Modify Ross Island Bridge: Increase to six lanes (three each way), eliminate bottlenecks at west end (include direct connections to I-5), eliminate bottlenecks at east end (add direct connections to MLK/Grand).
 - 5. Build East Marquam Interchange Phase Four (connections between Marquam and 99E).
- D. **Grand Avenue/MLK Viaduct Reconstruction and Ross Island Bridge Repair:**
 - 1. Construct traffic ramp from King to Division Street at SE Harrison Street; signalize
 - 2. Construct pair of on and off-ramps to Division Place from Grand Avenue Viaduct.
 - 3. Widen and improve SE Woodward between McLoughlin and SE Eighth.
 - 4. Install traffic light at SE 8th Avenue and Powell Boulevard.
 - 5. Improve Division Place and Eighth Avenue streets to collector standards in Southern Triangle area within existing rights-of-way.

6. Provide new street connection from SE Seventh to SE Eighth/Division signal; revise local access.

E. Relieve Martin Luther King and Grand Avenue congestion:

1. Develop North and South truck routes through the district.
2. Reconstruct eastbound SE Belmont Street ramp to southbound MLK to prevent weaving.
3. Reconstruct eastbound SE Hawthorne ramp to southbound MLK, separating it from Clay Street.
4. Construct pedestrian access on westside of Grand at Morrison and Hawthorne Bridge heads.

TESTIMONY FOR HEARING
IN REGARD TO TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
FOR THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Tuesday, October 26, 1999

Kenneth McFarling 7417 S E 20th Av, Portland, 97202-6213

Chairman and Councilors:

Individuals who exercise planning authority over transport facilities,
and who engage in promotional efforts in behalf of those facilities,
should strive conscientiously
to assure that whichever technology is intrinsically best
for performing each transportation task will be chosen for that task.

The choice should be unwarped by the circumstance
that what is often the intrinsically best technology
is not the protege of a promotional agency of government,
Federal or otherwise.

The choice should be unimpeded by the traditional prerequisite
to the application of railway technology:
The proprietor of a railway must attract capital from voluntary investors
by showing substantial reason
to anticipate a respectable return on investment.

Investors recognize that railway earnings are subject to taxation,
and quite unlike off-track transport forms,
railway infrastructure is likewise subject to taxation.

Investors recognize that the proceeds of that taxation,
rather than being earmarked to improve railway infrastructure,
are in part spent to provide expensive facilities and services
for off-track transport forms.

For appropriate comparison of costs
between a private enterprise railway and another transport form,
offset the cost of railway use
by giving credit for the relevant amount of taxes it pays.

Choice of technology should take into account
the much more frugal use of land by a railway,
in comparison with a road of equal capacity.
(Think also of the land devoted to providing for conveyance storage.)

The habitable surface of the Earth is not increasing.
Increasing population is constantly cited as creating need
for devoting ever more space to roads.
Population has other needs -- vital needs -- which also require space.
Providing for those other needs should be of as much concern to you
as covering more of the planet with asphalt.

Choices by you and your staffs should take into account the intrinsically more economical use of energy by railway motive power, in comparison with off-track conveyances of equal capacity.

Your choices should take into account the impact of pavement and vehicles on the cost of facilities to combat floods, and of facilities to dispose of polluted water. Road users pay none of those costs.

Taxes which the general public pays on property and on income defray numerous other costs which are attributable to roads and to road users. You should strive to impose costs on the activities which are the cause.

Wherever railway technology would be most suitable, choose it.

A proper choice should not be dismissed by assertion that dealing with proprietors of railways is too difficult. You need to demonstrate inclination to cooperate, for mutual benefit. Consider contracts for service or other arrangements providing a reasonable rate of return on investment. That would be neither a gold mine for a railway proprietor nor confiscation of any part of his assets.



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

Sid Morrison
Secretary of Transportation

Southwest Region

4200 Main Street
P.O. Box 1709
Vancouver, WA 98668-1709

(360) 905-2000
(360) 905-2222 Fax

October 26, 1999

Henry H. Hewitt, Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission
900 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 2300
Portland, OR 97204

Jon Kvistad
Metro Transportation Division
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Kvistad:

The purpose of this letter is to provide additional comments during your public comment period on the projects being proposed for funding from the ODOT \$600 million bond program in the Portland Metropolitan Area Supplemental STIP.

The Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) strongly supports Project 17 that would widen I-5 from Delta Park to Lombard Street to 3 lanes in each direction. One of the most frequent public comments we hear, even from communities on I-5 north of Vancouver, is to fix the bottleneck on I-5 south of Delta Park. WSDOT is currently funding a \$51 million project to widen I-5 to 3 lanes in each direction in Vancouver from Main Street to 99th Street. The Delta Park widening would remove the last 2 lane segment for traffic on I-5 from 99th Street in Vancouver to the Greely/Banfield area of I-5 near the Rose Quarter. The project would provide temporary relief from some congestion and would certainly be included in any package of highway improvements to the I-5 corridor. It is relatively low cost compared to other projects in the I-5 corridor and can easily be completed in the next 6 years.

WSDOT recognizes the extreme importance of the I-5 corridor to the movement of goods and people in the region. We also advocate Project 5 in the Greely/ Banfield area of I-5 near the Rose Quarter. WSDOT regrets that ODOT and JPACT believe that Project 5 cannot be constructed in six years. For that reason we also urge selection and earliest completion of Project 13. This project would develop a project design for this segment that meets both ODOT and local jurisdiction criteria.


Mr. Hewitt
Mr. Kvistad
October 26, 1999
Page 2

We also recommend that ODOT and JPACT retain Project 5 on list of projects with a nominal level of funding in order to retain the flexibility to fund early stages of the project such as right of way on this segment of I-5 should Project 13 in conjunction with the I-5 Trade Corridor Study result in the ability for ODOT to begin construction within the next 6 years.

Finally, although funding for completion of the I-5 Trade Corridor Study was not included on the project list we recommend that ODOT program funds to continue this planning study in Region 1 in order to maintain the funding flexibility to implement the studies' Corridor Development and Management Plan recommendations for Project Development (EIS and final project design). Continuing these studies during the six-year time frame may be critical for obtaining federal funding for construction of the Trade Corridor Study's preferred alternatives in following six-year federal funding cycle.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Donald R. Wagner, P.E.
Regional Administrator

DRW:kd
Wagner/ODOT & JPACT Comment

cc: Kay Van Sickel

THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Metro's Regional Transportation Plan is supposed to be the region's transportation blueprint for the next 20 years. A future vision I do not share.

This plan is primarily an extensive laundry list of obsolete highway projects that individually may temporarily unsnarl some traffic bottle necks --- but collectively will promote more auto traffic. This in turn will create still larger more costly bottle necks to fix in the future. The public transit component is pitifully inadequate. It's more like a modest 5 year plan than a creative 20 year vision.

If approved and funded, this RTP will add over 600 lane miles of freeway and arterial traffic, cause peak hour congestion to more than double and result in a 2% increase in vehicle miles traveled per person (rather than the 10% decrease called for in the statewide planning goal). Also it will not cause a significant shift to public transit.

To solve our future transportation problems (problems that will be far worse if oil prices inflate faster than Metro has anticipated), we must control our temptation to to expand an already bloated highway system and instead invest wisely in effective public transportation.

The core of an effective transit system is a rational, connected bus network providing 20-24 hour, 7 day a week service every 10-15 minutes. This service should be allowed to operate unimpeded by other traffic as much as possible.

*** The proposed bus plans in the RTP options lack adequate frequency, speed and critical linkages.**

In high demand corridors buses should be supplemented with rail service. This was the guiding principal that led to the construction of MAX. In fact the demand is growing so fast on MAX that within 10 to 15 years, longer trains will be needed to accommodate the peak rush.

Downtown will become a major light rail bottle neck. The traffic, short blocks and pedestrian activity are not compatible with longer trains and a subway

will be needed in the central city by 2020.

* The imminent capacity problems on MAX are not addressed in the RTP.

Additional light rail will be needed, especially on the Barbur and North/South Corridors. A line between Oregon City and Vancouver should have been under construction by now.

Unfortunately Metro planners, in their zeal to accommodate political interests, proposed extending the line into areas of low demand, far north into Clark County and to Clackamas Town Center which triggered voter disapproval in these counties.

* A much needed Barbur light rail line is not in the RTP yet Metro planners continue proposing Clackamas Town Center as a prime destination in spite of public rejection.

Commuter rail service is an excellent way to alleviate peak hour congestion in major travel corridors. In addition it can provide fast convenient all day access to outlying communities such as Newberg, McMinnville, Canby, Woodburn, Camas, Longview, Forest Grove, Wilsonville and Salem. The proposed Beaverton to Wilsonville commuter line, if extended to Milwaukie, would be good short term start of a commuter rail system.

* Over 100 miles of rail lines in the metropolitan area serving primary travel corridors are not being considered for passenger service in the RTP.

Within the next 20 years, a new multimodal transportation station should be considered on the east side, probably near the Rose Quarter, where convenient intermodal connections can be made between long distance trains, regional high speed trains, commuter trains, light rail trains, intercity buses, local buses and even airplanes, (by providing ticketing and baggage handling services as a compliment to the excellent light rail access soon to be provided to the airport).

If the proposed Regional Transportation Plan is the blueprint for improving the regions transportation system in the next 20 years, then this blueprint should definitely go back to the drawing board for some serious revisions.

**Written
comments
for the RTP**

You can send or call in
your testimony directly
to Metro:

Mail

Metro
RTP Comments
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Fax

(503) 797-1794

E-mail

arthurc@metro.dst.or.us

Phone

(503) 797-1900

Date 10 / 26 / 1999

Name Michael Kepche

Affiliation SELF - WRNA

Address 39215 N.E. 28th

City/state/ZIP Washouga WA ⁹⁸⁶⁷¹

Phone No. (360) 837-83922

E-mail address _____

Comments I would like to see 3
projects (1) a new Bridge between
the I-5 Bridges For light Rail into
Clark County & other Short Redevelopment
Convention Center. (2) Freight
Transportation improvements on
the I-5 Corridor - possibly a
re look at the Bridge study done
in 1983 by the Seattle firm of
Berk-lee for a Six Lane Bridge
By Pass from Vancouver Lake out
Past Hillsboro and Back to I-5
at Newberg. (3) a Major Rezone
and Road for Freight Improvement
between I-5 & I-205 on either
Columbia Blvd or Portland Blvd.

**ODOT/Metro Public Comment Meeting
Clackamas County
Thursday October 28, 1999**

1. Commissioner Michael Jordan: Clackamas County Commissioner – Commenting on the SSTIP

Supports the Sunrise Corridor project. This project is critical for Clackamas County to implement the 2040 vision. According to the plan, this area will be getting additional housing and appropriate regional transportation facilities are needed to serve the new residents. Likewise, there is a need to ensure that we can move freight in and out of the area. The Clackamas County Advisory Committee voted this project as its highest priority.

2. Jerry Smith: 337 SE 7th Avenue, Canby, OR 97013, 263-8429
Chair of the Clackamas County Economic Development Commission – Commenting on the SSTIP

Supports the Sunrise Corridor project. Hwy 212/I-205 intersection has more trucks than I-5/Columbia River. This area needs the improvements that the Sunrise Corridor project will provide. See letter submitted in support of this project.

3. Senator Verne Duncan & Lynn Snodgrass, Jane Lokan – Commenting on the SSTIP

Representative Lynn Snodgrass: Speaker of the House of Representatives
269 State Capitol, Salem, OR 97310 986-1200

While the Legislature did not vote on per se, members were aware of specific projects. There was an understanding that there would not substantial changes to the list. Of critical concern is the Sunrise Corridor project. This project has been a longstanding commitment of ODOT and given the importance of the project to freight movement and future growth in Clackamas County it should be built at its revised cost of \$72 million. Don't do what everyone fears by moving projects off the list and adding new projects. Move forward with this first unit of the Sunrise Corridor. See letter submitted in support of this project.

Representative Jane Lokan: District 25

5317 SE El Centro Way, Milwaukie, OR 97267 654-9691

Urges JPACT & ODOT to continue moving forward with the Sunrise Corridor project. The Clackamas Industrial connection is on the list and wants ODOT to continue move forward with it. This project has been materializing for over a decade. It is Clackamas County's turn to have some attention. Since Clackamas County is slated for the bulk of future growth in the Portland area, the County needs this project now. The cost only goes up so the delays are continuing to cause the project to increase. See letter submitted in support of this project.

Senator Verne Duncan: District 12

16911 SE River Road, Milwaukie, OR 97222 659-8091

Supports this Sunrise Corridor project. Although the projects weren't selected by the Legislature, there is an expectation that the list of projects were highly supported. There was nothing binding, however and they knew there could be changes. Keeping to the original project trust is part of the process of building trust between the Legislature and ODOT.

4. Edith Kerbaugh: Milwaukie Citizen Forum – Commenting on the RTP
12341 SE 67th Court, Milwaukie, OR 97222 653-8015

Speaking about the light rail in the south corridor. She thought light rail would go down McLoughlin, but found that was not necessarily true. She is not supportive of LRT along Linwood/Harmony. Her perception of why the voters said “no” was because of all the displaced families. It is the alignment.

5. Eugene Grant, Mayor of Happy Valley & Randy Nicolay, City of Happy Valley –
Commenting on the SSTIP and the RTP

Randy Nicolay, 13445 SE King, Portland 97236 726-0677

Is supportive of the Sunrise Corridor project. Is concerned about what will happen to Hwy 212 with all of the growth and the truck traffic if this project is not completed.

Eugene Grant, 11311 SE Charview Ct., Clackamas, OR 97015 698-5822

SSITP: Is supportive of the Sunrise Corridor project. The current infrastructure won't support the employment growth that is expected. Sunnyside Road is extremely congested now and getting worse.

RTP: The timelines for many Clackamas County projects are way off. The growth is occurring now. Wants Sunnyside Rd widened from 122nd to 162nd now and not in 2011 as stated in the RTP. Wants to hold to the urban growth boundary, but the RTP is not acting fast enough to deal with growth. The RTP needs to correspond with what is happening on the ground. There is a need to look at creative financing to fund projects. See e-mail message for additional comments.

6. Julie North: P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97201 725-4412
Portland State University Administration—Mgr of Transportation – Commenting on the RTP

- Students have unique transit needs. They use transit at off-peak hours. The RTP should acknowledge this special need and support better transit service.
- Supports South/North light rail.
- Supports the Central City Streetcar and the extension to the North Macadam area.

See comments submitted on the RTP.

7. Rob Kappa: 12143 SE 38th Avenue, Milwaukie, OR 97222 653-9575
Citizen – Commenting on the RTP and the SSTIP:

RTP: Light rail coming through Milwaukie again! He is not supportive of this light rail alignment.

SSTIP: Supports the McLoughlin project. If the bonding package does not pass with the voters, we need to find other methods of funding. Regardless of whether the bonding measure passes, he wants extensive public involvement outreach process.

8. Chris Utterback: PO Box 1112, Clackamas, Oregon 97015 658-5338
Citizen of Clackamas County, CPO Chairman, and Happy Valley Planning Commission. Commenting on the SSTIP

Supports the Sunrise Corridor project. There needs to be a good east/west connector in the area.

9. Jim Osterman: 22329 Clear Creek Rd, Estacada, OR 97023 653-8881
President of Oregon Cutting Systems Division of Blount Inc. – Commenting on the SSITP

Transportation is critical to getting employees to and from work and freight in and out of the manufacturing plant. He supports the Sunrise Corridor project on the bonding list. Growth is coming and this area needs the infrastructure. Congestion is getting worse. See letter submitted in support of this project.

10. Wilda Parks: 7740 SE Harmony Rd, Milwaukie, OR 97222 654-2493
North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce - Commenting on the SSITP

The Chamber supports the Sunrise Corridor project. Project is of statewide significance because it will accommodate planned growth, improve freight mobility, provide safe recreation travel, is consistent with the Oregon Highway Plan, can be completed in the 6 years, and qualifies for additional leveraging of funds. See letter submitted in support of this project.

11. Roger Lakey: 576 N Tomahawk Island Drive, Portland, OR 97217
Hayden Island Neighborhood Assoc. – Commenting on the SSTIP

- Supports the Project 17: widening I-5 from Delta Park to Lombard.
- It is very difficult getting onto Hayden Island when bridge is up or there is a wreck. On the northbound half of the new Marine Drive interchange there is space to put 4 travel lanes. The 4th lane should be marked as Hayden Island and emergency vehicles only.
- Port of Portland project on west end of Hayden Island. They want to come through residential streets to reach their development. They suggest

approximately \$200,000 worth of work on local streets. The need is much greater than that.

- They really need a bridge from Hayden Island to Vancouver. It could be used to fix LRT, Port access and other problems.

12. Eugene Schoenheit: 13780 SE Fernridge, Milwaukie 97222
Citizen – Commenting on the RTP

Metro is missing the point. The way to relieve traffic is to add more lanes to I-205. He is opposed to continuing light rail to Clackamas Town Center. It has been voted down. The ridership just won't be there. Some people were told this was not a light rail meeting. Light rail is in the RTP therefore, we should be able to comment.

13. Ed Zumwalt: 10888 SE 29th, Milwaukie, OR 97222 654-2493
Chair of Historic Milwaukie Neighborhood Association – Commenting on the RTP

He is appalled that light rail in this area has been revived. "Add new LRT in long term. . . ." He is not interested in density as proposed. Drop any thought to add light rail into the community.

14. Dick Jones: 3205 SE Vineyard Rd, Oak Grove 97267 652-2998
Commenting on the SSITP and the RTP

SSITP: He supports the Sunrise Corridor project. He is a Clackamas County resident and serves on a number of committees. Long lines in both directions backed up on Hwy 212. People want less congestion. The Sunrise is ready for construction. See letter of support for this project.

RTP:

- Opposes light rail in Clackamas County
- Supports construction of a new south/north arterial in the east part of the metropolitan area linking the Clackamas area with the Columbia Corridor area.
- Supports development of a strategy to get the message out to people about how to reduce congestion.

15. William Garity: 41440 SE Squaw Mtn. Rd, Estacada 97033 630-6250
Represents public employees of Clackamas County – Commenting on the SSTIP

- Accountability: Sunrise Corridor has been talked about for about 13 years. Route was adopted about 3 year ago. It is a priority.
- Livability: Clack industrial area provides family wage jobs. This corridor will open up more industrial area.
- Clackamas Co. needs to get its fair share.

See letter submitted in support of the project.

16. Michal Wert: 8405 SW Nimbus Ave., Beaverton, OR 97008 372-3533
Columbia Corridor Association – Commenting on the SSTIP

Columbia/Killingsworth project supporter. City of Portland & Port just finished a study. This is an important freight route and it experiences heavy congestion. The Columbia Corridor area is a large industrial. I-205 and Killingsworth are the main transportation routes. See letter submitted in support of the project.

17. Wes Wanvig: 7705 SE Harmony, Milwaukie, OR 97222 654-1607
Citizen - Commenting on the RTP

- Supports funding for King Road/Fuller Road signal. There is a tower to put up lights, but it doesn't have a signal. He wants it taken care of.
- Regarding congestion in the Clackamas industrial area he suggests reestablishing the old road that used to run parallel to I-205/Railroad.
- Traffic problems on Hwy 224 at Carver. Wants a traffic light at Carver Bridge & Hwy 224.

18. Bob Shannon: 17421 SE Vogel Rd, Boring, OR 658-5492
Citizen from Damascus - Commenting on the RTP and the SSTIP
RTP:

- Suggests that Clackamas County get some of the federal funding earmarked for the transit projects and then use them for highway projects.
- There should be bus service from Oregon City to Tualatin or Wilsonville.

SSTIP: Supports the Sunrise Corridor project.

19. Mark Schoening, City Engineer, City of Lake Oswego, P. O. Box 369, Lake Oswego, OR 97034, (503) 635-0274
Commenting on the SSTIP and the RTP

SSITP: Appreciates ODOT including Project #18 (I-5/Hwy. 217/Kruse Way Interchange – Phase 2) for \$35 million. It will go to construction early next year.

The City of Lake Oswego has funded a project to interconnect Bange with Kruse Way. The City of Lake Oswego and Clackamas County have an IGA to dedicate all Transportation STCs collected in the Kruse Way corridor to the Kruse Way project. First is the Boones Ferry intersection. Lake Oswego will be receiving TMA exploratory funds for the project.

RTP: Lake Oswego's top priority, #5163 (A Ave Reconstruction). To complement that, Lake Oswego is completing the multimillion dollar construction of a park south of A Avenue. Also, the City Council selected a new library site one block north of that. There is a lot of redevelopment activity adjacent to A Avenue, so Lake Oswego is very interested in that particular RTP project.

Supportive of the Rosemont/Stafford intersection project on the county's five-year plan.

Regarding an I-5/217 land use question, responded that the Kruse Way corridor is zoned commercial and is developing as anticipated and this naturally exacerbates traffic problems.

20. Barry Broomham, 19141 Lot Whitcomb Drive, Oregon City 97045, (503) 657-1187
Commenting on the SSTIP

Speaking as a citizen but also on the board of directors of North Clackamas County; also acts as a corporate consultant and has several clients in this area. Addressed STIP Project #4 (Clackamas Industrial Connection). Sees the congestion in the area as enormous. The interchange would certainly alleviate that. It'll help the north/south traffic on I-205. The businesses in that area are primarily transportation oriented, warehouses, etc. Taking the exit to get on Hwy. 212 to I-205 or NE 82nd Drive just isn't long enough for the semis. One truck boggles it all up. If you're on 82nd Drive it's impossible to get on I-205. They back up on Hwy. 212 considerably coming the other way. This bypass connector would be great. They really need it. This started as the Sunrise Corridor Project, which disappeared. This is a key influence in that, though. This will help the east/west transportation system significantly in this area.

It'll improve the environmental conditions, which is a large factor, too, i.e., the pollution from all those trucks.

When questioned how to pay for this, said to trade it for some other unfortunate soul who doesn't get their project. This should be included in the \$600 mill package.

Mr. Cotugno said this is a pretty skimpy \$72 million cost; it's only two-lanes worth. He asked Mr. Broomham what he thinks of using that \$72 million and supplementing it with tolls and building the full project. Mr. Broomham thinks people would go for that. He said businesses would accept it because it would save them a lot of money. The problem is usually during the 5:00 rush hour, but one never knows. It can happen at any time, but it always happens at 5:00 p.m.

To identify the areas this would benefit, Mr. Broomham stated if you took Hwy. 212 all the way out to Hwy. 224, the entire industrial area – add the benefit of the warehousing district – getting from the warehouse to the manufacturing plant – the influence would be the entire length of Hwy. 224 from Milwaukie. Asked how he felt if it were to be for trucks only, he said that was an excellent idea. He also would not object to it being a toll road. He doesn't know how it could be made a toll road for such a short passage, but it would be a great start. Even if it were left at two lanes for trucks only, that, too, would be a good start. Individuals may object, but the larger industrials would welcome it.


Responding to a gas tax questions from Councilor Kight, Mr. Broomham said the Chamber of Commerce is in favor of and has supported it. The problem is the weight/mile tax – the Chamber is still in favor of it but it'll affect some members. It's going to find a tough road. Mr. Kight then asked if anyone at the Chamber has talked about a Plan B regarding transportation. Mr. Broomham replied that no, they've taken the stance that we shouldn't need one, they'll wait for the legislature. He's tried to promote another alternative where they can take other funds and channel them into what they already have; this may avoid the gas tax increase and mollify the people who don't want it.

21. Robert Wheeler, 12088 SE Reginald Ct., Happy Valley 97015
Commenting on the SSTIP

Also represents the Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce, chairs the Land Use Transportation Committee. Favors the Clackamas Industrial Corridor (old Sunrise Corridor Project). Realizes AAA has the signatures they need for the gas tax and knows the bond measure is tied to that. The Chamber doesn't want to see this project die because the gas tax gets voted down. They know there are other important things to be done, but feel this is a critical project for this region. The Sunrise Corridor Project would relieve (and its a small phase) and reduce traffic on NE 82nd, Hwys. 224 and 212, and I-205 – in the middle of the afternoon you get a backup on I-205 where people are just sitting there, waiting on the ramp to get on.

He doesn't know how to pay for it, but hearing the previous testimony about toll roads, he can't imagine that many companies would object to that in order to expedite traffic. If the gas tax fails, this project goes on the shelf. A problem with the gas tax is that business people object to it, feeling Oregon trucking companies would be more burdened (equity issue). I don't know if that's true. A member of my committee is affiliated with the trucking business and he filled me in. There was resistance at our Land Use Committee meeting last month when we had a speaker on Measure 76. Also, just because it's a constitutional amendment some of my committee object simply because of that.

Regarding maintenance, Mr. Wheeler said he's a Maryland native and that their roads are in much better condition than Oregon's because they have outlawed studs and chains, that if Oregon did this they could substantially reduce their maintenance budget. He then commented that Oregon is one of the lowest in the country as far as money spent toward transportation.



October 28, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission,
The Oregon Department of Transportation,
And the Metro Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation
123 NW Flanders
Portland, Oregon 97209

Dear Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission;

The Clackamas County Economic Development Commission strongly supports the construction of Phase 1 of the Sunrise Corridor. This project is vitally important to the development of Clackamas County's economy. It has long been specifically listed as a high priority project in the 1986 Economic Development Plan and again in the updated 1997 Economic Development Plan.

We feel that the Sunrise Corridor is critical to the development of the Clackamas Industrial Area, one of the largest employment centers in the County. This project will play a key role in attracting and keeping employers here and enabling them to expand their businesses. The Sunrise Corridor will also provide a strong link in the transportation system needed to facilitate freight movement and preserve access to interregional shipping facilities.


Currently the I-205 /Highway 212-224 interchange remains one of the most congested in the region despite significant investments in the Jennifer Street overpass and widening of 82nd Drive to the Gladstone Interchange. Better transportation access to this area will reduce the out of pocket and time costs to our businesses. Large distribution oriented firms in the area include the Fred Meyer Distribution Center, Safeway Food Distribution, TNT/Reddaway, Pacific Seafood Company, Emmert International, North Pacific Supply, Wymore Transfer and others.

Our Economic Development plan is consistent with many other transportation and land use plans in Clackamas County and Region. Each plan recognizes this project's importance in achieving the objectives of improving the efficiency and safety of the regional transportation system; enhancing the effectiveness of a key freight corridor to better serve a major employment area and industrial sanctuary (Clackamas Industrial Area); and reducing congestion and associated air pollution.

Within the Portland metropolitan region, Clackamas County currently suffers from a poor jobs-to-housing balance. As the nearby Damascus and Pleasant Valley Urban Reserves are brought into the UGB, the continued viability of this Industrial Area employment base will be important in realizing the objectives of the METRO 2040 Growth Concept to minimize urban sprawl and resulting long commutes.

For all of the reasons stated above, the Economic Development Commission urges you and other regional and state leaders to approve the construction of Phase 1 of the Sunrise Corridor.

Sincerely;

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jerry Smith".

Jerry Smith, Chair
Clackamas County Economic Development Commission



LYNN SNODGRASS
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE
OREGON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

October 28, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
Supplemental STIP Comments
123 NW Flanders
Portland OR 97209

Dear Mr. Hewitt:


We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.


It is our understanding that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the METRO Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) are asking for comments on an initial list of projects and an additional list of projects that would be built from the bond revenue made available within HB 2082. As HB 2082 worked its way through the House and Senate of the 1999 Oregon Legislature we were fully aware of the initial list of projects that ODOT presented to the respective chambers. The list was not voted on per se, however, it is our belief that members were aware of specific projects represented by ODOT as bonding priority. Furthermore, it appeared there was not to be substantial changes in the list of projects that ODOT would submit to the Emergency Board in February 2000.


Of critical concern to us is the Clackamas Industrial Connection (Sunrise Corridor) project listed by ODOT at initially \$65 million. This project has been around since 1988 as a part of the development of the Access Oregon Highway program. Now, some twelve years later, we are still awaiting funding. Given the long-standing commitment of ODOT to this project, and the extreme importance it has in managing statewide freight movement, as well as the future growth in Clackamas County, we fully support the inclusion of this project at the revised construction cost estimate of \$72.5 million, which is contained in ODOT's final list for Emergency Board consideration.

ODOT's *State and Federal Highway Revenues and Expenditures by County and Region, August 1999* report indicates that for the six year period of 1996-2001 Clackamas County receives only 0.86 cents back on each dollar in taxes paid by our constituents. This "donor county status" makes the investment by ODOT to the Clackamas Industrial Connection project a fair and warranted allocation of scarce resources. In addition, this project would partially correct a historical funding inequity in transportation investments in Clackamas County and provide the County some relief to its rapid growth.


We look forward to seeing the \$72.5 million Clackamas Industrial Connection project in the list that the OTC will submit to the Emergency Board.



Lynn Snodgrass, Speaker of the House


Vern Duncan, Senator


Marilyn Shannon, Senator


Jane Lokan, Representative


Kathy Lowe, Representative


Kurt Schrader, Representative



JANE LOKAN

State Representative

Oregon Legislative Assembly
District 25 • Clackamas County

October 28, 1999

Members of the JPACT and Oregon Department of Transportation:

My name is Jane Lokan, State Representative from Oregon House District 25 in Milwaukie. Thank you for bringing this meeting to Clackamas County. I am here to especially urge JPACT and ODOT to carry forward with construction of the Clackamas Industrial Connection, formerly known as the Sunrise Corridor.

During the most recent Legislative session I was proud to be chief sponsor of HB 2478, which was signed into law by Governor Kitzhaber. This bill is known as the Transportation Spending Accountability Act. It directs the ODOT to identify projects on their priority spending list for each biennial budget, and specify the time frame for project completion. The Clackamas Industrial Connection is among the projects listed on ODOT's most recent project list, and I urge ODOT to move forward with construction in keeping with this legislative directive.

It was also my privilege to support HB 2082 during the 1999 session. I am here tonight to support that portion of HB 2082 that deals with the \$600 million bonding program. This bonding program is a creative and an innovative approach to funding key transportation projects throughout the state of Oregon.

It has been more than a decade since the Oregon Transportation Commission designated the Sunrise Corridor as an Access Oregon Highway. Between 1988 and 1996 the Commission, ODOT and Clackamas County have worked cooperatively to move this project forward. In fact, we have been very patient in Clackamas County, awaiting our turn!

Now the time has come for the Sunrise Corridor to become a reality as the Clackamas Industrial Connection. Indeed, METRO has included this project in the Regional Transportation plan as a regional highway corridor, and ODOT has a long-standing commitment to this project. Since Clackamas County has been slated for the bulk of future urban growth, it is imperative that this project be completed to maintain the livability that hallmarks Clackamas County.

During my tenure in the Oregon House, I worked hard to bring fiscal accountability to many aspects of government. And without a question, when we apply the issue of fiscal accountability to this project, it is clear that we need to move forward without further delay. Already, the projected construction costs alone have escalated from \$65 million to \$72 million. We must also be considerate of the average 12-15% annual escalation in the

cost of acquiring right-of-way property, and any increases in cost of design and engineering services that additional delays would bring about.

As a State Representative from one of Oregon's high growth counties, and keeping in mind both the letter and spirit of HB 2478 and HB 2082, I urge you to move forward on a critically important project, the Clackamas Industrial Connection, with all deliberate speed, placing the Clackamas Industrial Connection as a top priority now and for the 2001-03 biennium.

I look forward to seeing this project on the list that will be submitted to the Emergency Board at the Legislature. Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

From: "Grant, Eugene" <EGrant@schwabe.com>
To: "arthurc@metro.dst.or.us" <arthurc@metro.dst.or.us>
Date: Fri, Oct 15, 1999 7:48 AM
Subject: Transportation supplemental STIP List comments

As Mayor of Happy Valley, I wanted to put in my two cents worth on the project list even though we all know the risk is high the gas tax increase will be repealed by initiative. The Sunrise Corridor project from I 205 to 145th is my top priority, since it ties in with the most important transportation problem of my City and the surrounding area. Traffic conditions on Sunnyside Road and Highway 212 are terribly congested and unsafe. Metro previously brought the Rock Creek Reserves (area from SE 145th to 162nd both north and south of Sunnyside Road) into the Urban Growth Boundary and just about everyone wants to see Happy Valley annex these areas sooner rather than later as a means to comply with the Metro Functional Plan and help fund further transportation improvements on Sunnyside Road and SE 147th. The Sunrise Corridor Project is an important element that will help make annexation and urbanization of the Rock Creek Reserves beneficial from a transportation and land use planning standpoint. This is because much of the through traffic currently using Sunnyside Road will use the Sunrise Corridor. The Sunrise Corridor will also facilitate access to the Urban Reserve land East and South of the Rock Creek Reserves which is the prime location for intense employment uses that will help solve the very bad jobs/housing imbalance in Clackamas County. This employment use land cannot be urbanized until we solve the transportation problems between I 205 and SE 172nd both in the Sunnyside Road Corridor and the 212 corridor. The Sunrise Corridor is the most critical part of that solution. The Rock Creek Reserves project will help solve the Sunnyside Road part of the problem, but without the Sunrise Corridor, there will not be enough transportation facilities to attack and conquer the jobs/housing imbalance we have out there. Please help us find a way to fund this regionally important project to help meet these goals.

PS for Rod Monroe and Bill Atherton: If Metro decides not to expand the UGB this year, it will leave Clackamas County without anything close to sufficient land with which to overcome the jobs/housing imbalance. The Rock Creek Reserves will help a little, but the hilly topography and location away from major transportation routes mean that the market will not support too much intense employment uses there. The real potential for addressing the jobs/housing imbalance in Clackamas County is the land to the east and south of the the Rock Creek area, (that is Pleasant Valley down to Hwy 212). In order to get there, Metro will have to bring it into the UGB and then help us find funding for the key transportation elements (172nd for north/south and Sunrise Corridor freeway for east west). Hitting the pause button on growth in North Clackamas County right now leaves us in a huge hole due to past land use decisions that have resulted in this terrible jobs/housing imbalance and failing service levels for traffic on SS Road and Hwy 212. Please help us by not taking an oversimplified approach to UGB expansion that ignores subregional realities and needs such as this. Thanks for your help.

By the way, I also strongly support the need for the Hwy 99 project thru Milwaukie, which is a terrible bottle neck right now.

Eugene L. Grant
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Proposed statement by Julie North, Manager of Transportation and Parking Services
before:

METRO hearing on the Regional Transportation Plan
October 28, 1999

I am pleased to be here tonight to offer, on behalf of the Portland State University Administration, our comments on the Regional Transportation Plan. I am the parking manager at Portland State University which means I am responsible for the overseeing the University's transportation management plan. Portland State University is Oregon's urban university and that designation compels us to be actively involved in issues that affect the University and the region. A multimodal, comprehensive transportation system is integral to the mission of PSU and essential if we are going to be able to be responsive to the needs of our students. Transportation policy is important to the metropolitan region and it is vitally important to PSU. A majority of our students are nontraditional, older, work, and have family responsibilities. Every year, we serve more than 16,000 students, we employ 1900 faculty and staff, and we have more than 5 million visits to the campus. Serving the needs of these people requires a plan and it requires us to coordinate our efforts with the region.

PSU is working to reduce automobile use by student, faculty, and staff

Portland State University's plan encourages public transit, use of bicycles, and walking as key transportation modes used by students, staff, and faculty. Automobile transportation will continue to be an important element of our strategy but since we only have 3,000 parking spaces, alternative transportation is critical to our ability to serve the region and its students and businesses.

As part of the University's plans for public transit we have pursued three strategies. The first is a comprehensive bus pass program with Tri-Met. This program is subsidized by Tri-Met and by the University. It has been very successful with our campus community. In our recent negotiations on this policy, Tri-Met asked PSU to work with other colleges and universities in the region to develop a single bus plan for all students. That makes sense to us since many of our students are also taking classes at PCC, Mt. Hood, or Clackamas Community College and our faculty and students work closely with OGI, OHSU, Clark College and WSU Vancouver. For these reasons we believe it only makes sense that students should be treated equally and fairly throughout the system. I am the chair of a newly formed Higher Education Alternative Transit (HEAT) coalition (a list of our members is attached). We are working now to prepare a proposal for submission to Tri-Met for consideration. Our students tend to use public transportation during nonrush hours and if we can encourage the use of transit among traditional aged-students we believe we can build a community of lifelong transit riders.

Recommendation: The Regional Transportation Plan should include recognition that students at the region's institutions of higher education (about 100,000) have unique public transit needs and

programs and policies should encourage use of the Tri-Met and C-Tran systems in a coordinated way. We support the elements of the plan that address new and improved bus services including rapid bus service, new buses, and frequent buses that link with the colleges and universities. I would also urge planners to understand that our peak hours are different than those of normal work hours so the RTP should support transit service that operates, for example, after our last class ends at 9:40 p.m.

The second component of our strategy has been focused on light rail and the central city streetcar. The University worked with transit planners and urban planners in designing its new Urban Center Building. This building will (thanks to the support of the transportation community) include a one-stop transit center for bus pass purchases and information. It is appropriate that the center be located on this site since it is the highest volume transit stop in the Tri-Met system. Educational partnerships with Clackamas County -- both at the Metro Center site near Clackamas Town Center and at the Community College -- require that we address ways to facilitate the commute from these areas to the campus.

Recommendation: Make the full development of the North South Light Rail line a priority and protect the original alignment that includes a link with the PSU Urban Center. We support the longer term plans to include a line to Oregon City and in the Highway 217 and Barbur Boulevard corridors.

The third element of our public transit plan includes the Central City Streetcar and its connection to Portland State University. We are pleased that the first phase of the Streetcar will come to the campus and we want to be a part of efforts to expand the service area covered by the Streetcar. Since our students and faculty are so involved in the community through research and teaching projects it is important for them to have access to transit serving the downtown area.

Recommendation: Make the Central City Streetcar a priority of the regional transportation plan and the extension to North Macadam.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the regional transportation plan. In closing, I want to encourage you to develop a final plan that:

- Continues the focus on multimodal transportation but places a high priority on public transit.
- Involves regional centers and high volume destinations in the planning effort and targets resources toward those areas. Both PSU and OHSU have unique transportation needs and are major destinations -- our needs should be considered as integral to the plan.
- Recognize that for some people the automobile is the only viable option for transportation and consideration must be given to their needs as well.

Portland State University is committed to being a part of the planning process and to making a constructive contribution to the overall discussion related to the region's transportation system.

As the region addresses these important issues please include my office in your correspondence and opportunities for involvement. Thank you for considering my comments this evening.

***Portland/Vancouver Area Alternative
Transportation Student Consortium
Roster***

Chair, Julie E. North
Portland State University
Transportation & Parking Services
P.O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207-0751
Phone: (503) 725-4412
Northj@pdx.edu

Co-Chair, Michael Surface
Lewis and Clark College
Transportation Manager
0615 SW Palatine Hill Road
Portland, Oregon 97219
Phone: (503) 76807794
surface@clark.edu

Rod Bartholomew
Transportation and Parking
Portland Community College
Sylvania Campus CC257
P.O. Box 19000
Portland, Oregon 97280-0990
Phone: (503) 977-4998
[Email:rbarthol@pcc.edu](mailto:rbarthol@pcc.edu)

Rebecca Leiv
Mt. Hood Community College
3975 SE Powell Blvd.
Portland, Oregon 97202
Phone: (503) 491-6924
Leivr@mhcc.cc.or.us

Louis Ornelas
Oregon Health Sciences University
3181 SW Sam Jackson Park Road PP220
Portland, Oregon 97201
Phone: (503) 494-2229
[Email:ornelasl@ohsu.edu](mailto:Ornelasl@ohsu.edu)

University of Portland
Marty Kovach, Residence Life
5000 N. Willamette Blvd.
Portland, Oregon
Phone: (503) 283-7911
Kovach@up.edu

***Reed College**
**Kevin Donegan, Director Community
Safety**
3203 SE Woodstock Blvd.
Portland, Oregon
Phone: (503) 771-7379

***Marylhurst University**
Glenn Vorres
P.O. Box 261
17600 Pacific Hwy.
Marylhurst, Oregon 97036
Phone: (503) 699-6256
Gvorres@marylhurst.edu

Washington State University
Glenn Ford
4204 NE Salmon Creek Avenue
Vancouver, Washington 98686
Phone: (360) 546-9590
Ford@vancouver.wsu.edu

Clark College
**Walter Hudsick, Chief Financial
Operations**
1800 E. McLoughlin Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98663
Phone: (360) 992-2413
whudsick@clark.edu

**National College of Naturopathic
Medicine**

Glenn Taylor/Sue (president's office)

O49 SW Porter

Portland, Oregon 97201

Phone: (503) 499-4343X1114

syirku@ncnm.edu

Registrar@ncnm.edu

**Pacific NW College of Art
Michael Hall, Director of Student
Services**

1241 NW Johnson

Portland, Oregon 97209

Phone: (503) 821-8920

Michael@pnca.edu

**Pacific University
Denise Price
Martina Fredericks**

2043 College Way

Forest Grove, Oregon 97116

Pricefd@pacificu.edu

Frederim@pacificu.edu

***Clackamas Community College**

Sara Simmons

19600 S. Molalla

Oregon City, OR 97045

Phone: (503) 657-6958 X 2442

Western Business College
President Randy Rogers
Jackie Ferguson, Academic Dean
Phone: 222-3225
(no email address at this time)

Warner Pacific
Steve Scott, Director of Plant Safety &
Security
2219 SE 68th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97215
Phone: (503) 775-4366
Sscott@warnerpacific.edu

Western States Chiropractic College

Pat Hohnstein

2900 NE 132nd St.

Portland, Oregon 97230

Phone: (503) 251-5734

Phohnst@wschiro.edu

Oregon Graduate Institute

Nancy Christie

20000 NW Walker Road

Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Phone: (503) 690-1027

Christie@bmb.ogi.edu

Multnomah Bible College & Seminary

Anna Staeger

8435 NE Glisan Street

Portland, Oregon 97220

Phone: (503) 255-0332

(no email address)

Concordia University

2811 NE Holman

Portland, Oregon 97211

Phone: (503) 288-9371

Revised 10-18-99

* indicates no participation or response
to date

OREGON CUTTING SYSTEMS DIVISION
4909 SE INTERNATIONAL WAY
PORTLAND, OR 97222 4679
PHONE: 503 653 8881
FAX: 503 653 4555

JAMES S. OSTERMAN
PRESIDENT
OUTDOOR PRODUCTS GROUP

BLOUNT

October 28, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
Supplemental STIP Comments
123 NW Flanders
Portland OR 97209

Dear Mr. Hewitt:


I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

It is my understanding that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the METRO Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) are asking for comments on an initial list of projects and an additional list of projects that would be built from the bond revenue made available within HB 2082. I testified and worked in support of HB 2082 during the 1999 Legislature. I was aware of the list of projects proposed by ODOT to be built by the bonding provisions of HB 2082 and support the Clackamas Industrial Connection project on this list.


Of critical concern to me as an employer of approximately 1,000 employees in Milwaukie is our ability to move freight in and out of our manufacturing plant, and the ability of our employees to get to work. The Clackamas Industrial Connection (Sunrise Corridor) project has been planned since 1988 as a part of the solution to freight mobility in the Region and Clackamas County, and to future growth challenges the County faces in moving its residents from home to work.

I fully support the inclusion of this project, at the revised construction cost estimate of \$72.5 million, in ODOT's final list for Emergency Board consideration.

Sincerely,


Jim Osterman, President
Outdoor Products Group

OREGON



Mission Statement
*To provide innovative leadership
to ensure a successful business climate
and promote the quality of life in Clackamas County.*

7740 SE Harmony Road • Milwaukie, OR 97222-1269 • 503/ 654-7777 • Fax 503/653-9515
website: www.yourchamber.com E-mail: ncccofc@yourchamber.com

Serving the needs of Business and the Community in; Milwaukie, Gladstone, Happy Valley, Johnson City, Clackamas, Sunnyside, Oak Grove, Damascus, Barton & Boring

August 25, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chairman
Oregon Transportation Commission
101 Transportation Building
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Chairman Hewitt:

The North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce (NCCCC) has been an active supporter over the years for additional transportation funding and most recently for the passage of increased gas and vehicle registration funding in the 1999 Legislature. We are aware of the provision in HB2082 that provides ODOT with the ability, pending Emergency Board approval in February 2000, to construct \$600 million of highway improvements throughout Oregon.

ODOT Director Grace Crunican presented to the Legislature a list of \$725 million in state highway projects which ODOT would recommend for the public's consideration, should additional funding become available through a bonding proposal. Understanding that ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) must reduce the list to \$600 million, we are writing to express our support for the retention of the \$65 million Clackamas Industrial Connection (I-205 to 145th) project as a part of the amended STIP that the OTC will submit to the Emergency Board in February.

The Clackamas Industrial Connection (commonly referred to as the Sunrise Corridor) was one of the original Access Oregon Highways identified for construction by Governor Goldschmidt and the 1987 Legislature. Since this project has been around from the late 1980's it has already gone through the environmental process with the final environmental impact statement expected for completion in 1999. In addition, ODOT and the County have approved the alignment for Unit 1.

We believe that the construction of this project from I-205 to 145th is of statewide significance for the following reasons: it will (1) accommodate the planned growth in North Clackamas County under the region's 2040 Growth Plan, (2) improve freight mobility and safe recreational travel from the metropolitan area to central and eastern Oregon, (3) is consistent with the recently adopted Oregon Highway Plan, (4) has the capacity to complete the project within six years and

(5) qualifies leveraging additional funds. Clackamas County, the business community and citizen groups have, over the years, supported the construction of this project.

The Chamber respectfully requests that the Clackamas Industrial Connection project be included in the amended STIP that the OTC will forward to the Emergency Board in February 2000.

Sincerely,

Chip Sammons, President

John Wyatt, Senior Vice-President

cc: Governor John A. Kitzhaber
Speaker of the Oregon House Lynn Snodgrass
Senator Randy Miller
Senator Marilyn Shannon
Senator Verne Duncan
Senator Ted Ferrioli
Senator Rick Mestger
Representative Jane Lokan
Representative Kurt Schrader
Representative Roger Beyer
Representative Richard Devlin
Representative Jerry Krummel
Representative Kathy Lowe
Representative Bob Montgomery
Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
Metro Executive Mike Burton
Oregon Transportation Commissioners
ODOT Director Grace Crunican
ODOT Region 1 Manager Kay Van Sickel

October 28, 1999

Testimony connected with ODOT Supplemental STIP

Support for Clackamas Industrial Corridor

I support the Clackamas Industrial Corridor project more widely referred to as the Sunrise Corridor in Clackamas County. I am a resident of Clackamas County and serve on several groups that are concerned with the Corridor. Several years ago while rebuilding my home I passed making purchases along Highway 224 because of congestion then and it is even worse today.

Unfortunately gridlock exists almost all day on Highway 224 with lines going back $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile even in mid morning. I have had to go to the Clackamas Industrial area twice recently. Both times I found traffic at 10:00 AM backed up from I-205 to Lumberman's Building Supply.

Nothing is being said of the changes which will occur when the North bound I-205 ramp lights are lit. Each truck will have to stop on an up slope before entering the freeway. Often these trucks are only going to the next exit, the Highway 224 offramp to Milwaukie and the industrial areas along it or to the frozen food warehouses along Highway 99 North of Milwaukie. If instead of going on I-205 trucks were to go north on 82nd Drive, 82nd Drive would become totally gridlocked.

Two other reasons I support this projects are: reduction of congestion and the project is ready for immediate construction. I reviewed, the criteria for selecting projects found on the Internet, and I was disappointed that among the seven criteria listed, reducing congestion was not included. Several studies I have seen say people want less congestion. I recognize some believe that congestion is a tool to help move people toward other modes of transportation. People are not going to support transportation improvements until reducing congestion is our FIRST goal. Secondly the Sunrise Corridor is ready for construction meaning an early impact on improved travel.

Thank you.

Submitted by,



Dick Jones

3205 SE Vineyard Rd.

Oak Grove, Or 97267

Phone (503)652-2998 Fax (503)353-9619 e-mail BULLDOGJONES@prodigy.net



AFSCME

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO

LOCAL 350

Representing the
Employees of:

350-0

Clackamas County
Department of
Transportation &
Development

350-1

City of West Linn

350-2

City of Oregon City

350-3

City of Gladstone

350-4

Clackamas County
Department of Utilities

350-5

City of Milwaukie

350-6

City of Canby

350-7

Clackamas County
Emergency
Communications

350-8

Rockwood Water
P.U.D.

October 28, 1999

Henry Hewitt, Chair
Oregon Transportation Commission
Supplemental STIP Comments
123 NW Flanders
Portland OR 97209

Dear Mr. Hewitt:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Supplemental Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

Building the Clackamas Industrial Connection (Sunrise Corridor) must continue to be a priority and be included in ODOT's submission to the Emergency Board.

In 1988 this project was designated an Access Oregon Highway. In 1989 Clackamas County amended our Comprehensive Plan to include the Sunrise Corridor. In 1996 our Board of County Commissioners heard testimony and approved the alignment of Phase 1.

Clackamas County is one of the fastest growing areas of the State. The Industrial Area served by this needed highway has a major employment potential. Enhancing the effectiveness of the freight corridor would partially correct a historical funding inequity of transportation investments within Clackamas County. As you are aware, Clackamas County is one of Oregon's "Donor Counties." We have received only 86% returns on each of our invested tax dollars.

We look forward to seeing the 72.5 million-dollar allocation to the Sunrise Corridor project on the list that the Oregon Transportation Commission will submit to the Emergency Board.

William A. Garity, President
D.T.D. Chapter, Local 350, AFSCME

COLUMBIA CORRIDOR ASSOCIATION

PO Box 55651
Portland, OR 97238

October 28, 1999

Jon Kvistad, Councilor
METRO
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Councilor Kvistad:

The Columbia Corridor Association would like to express our strong enthusiasm for constructing the E. Columbia/Killingsworth/ 87th Avenue connection with the ODOT bond program funds. The project is critical to maintaining good access to Columbia Boulevard businesses and for industries exporting and importing goods throughout the region via air freight. Studies analyzing efficient freight movement in the area, such as the Columbia Boulevard Study and the Airport Area Transportation Analysis, have been completed by a number of agencies. The East Columbia/Killingsworth connection is identified repeatedly as a transportation bottleneck that must be solved to keep goods moving on the system. Last year, the Port of Portland and City of Portland, in conjunction with ODOT, have completed an alternatives analysis to identify the best alternative for construction. A new connection at 87th Avenue best meets freight traffic and multi-modal objectives.

The current problem is acute. Traffic accessing I-205 from Columbia Boulevard backs up over a mile during the pm peak. As a result, traffic from businesses on Columbia Boulevard has to seek alternative routes to access the freeway. Columbia Boulevard is a two-lane facility that connects with I-205 through a signalized intersection at a railroad underpass. The intersection is very close to the I-205 interchange, limiting turning movements and constraining traffic flow. The proposed project that you would help fund would improve access from Columbia Boulevard to US 30 (Killingsworth) and I-205 through improved interchanges at 82nd Avenue at Columbia and US 30 Bypass

The Columbia Corridor has distinctive needs and transportation issues based on its business/industrial uses, and its function as the region's gateway to national and international trade. These uses rely heavily on efficient freight accessibility and mobility.

John Kvistad, Councilor
October 28, 1999
Page 2

Air cargo activity is dependent upon the landside transportation system for good access to freight forwarders, reload facilities and air cargo terminals. The majority of the region's air related facilities are located in the Columbia Corridor and rely heavily on Columbia Boulevard and I-205.

Addressing the needs of this area through strategic investments in transportation infrastructure is critical to maintaining the "economic engine", the role Columbia Corridor serves for the City, the metropolitan region and the state.

We appreciate your consideration of this important project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Wert", with a stylized, flowing script.

Michal A. Wert
Transportation Committee Co-Chair

CC: City of Portland Commissioner Charlie Hales
Port of Portland Mike Thorne

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PUBLIC HEARING

December 2, 1999

Metro Council Chamber

Councilors Present: Rod Monroe (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Ed Washington, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Jon Kvistad

Presiding Officer Monroe said Councilor Kvistad was Chair of both JPACT and the Transportation Planning Committee. Presiding Officer Monroe introduced Councilor Kvistad and turned the proceedings over to him.

Councilor Kvistad said they were there to talk about the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP was the region's attempt at managing, balancing and putting in place decisions about where (in what direction) Metro and the region would go. It was a five-year plan. He identified the RTP document and indicated that they were available for anyone who wanted a copy. A lot of people spent a lot of time and performed a lot of work on the RTP.

The public comments started the first part of October with brochures and the RTP. The Council held four listening posts out in the community in conjunction with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). This was a new experience for the Metro Council. The Council had not worked with ODOT directly on holding joint hearings. The ODOT operated a little differently than the Council but they were able to hold those hearings throughout October 1999.

The Council also had a series of brochures that had been available and distributed throughout the region to all seven Metro districts. Many people may have seen these brochures before. He said therefore there had been a lot of information out in the community on the RTP. The Council would be holding a JPACT committee meeting this week. It would be an extended meeting. He called it basically a regional transportation summit more than a meeting. The Council would be making some major decisions at the meeting, more so than some of the single-item decisions they typically made. The Council had received summaries and had available all the JPACT and MPAC recommendations, and all the comments had been categorized, depending on whether it was a discussion item or an action item.

He said today's comments would be added to the public record that the Council had from the Councils advisory committee as well as from public outreach efforts. What the Council had today was the MTAC recommendations, which were done. Metro Transportation Director Andy Cotugno confirmed what he said. He said the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee's (TPAC) recommendations would be done by Friday, December 3, 1999. He said at least that was what he planned for the completion date and time. The Transportation Planning Committee would hold a work session to put them all in order on December 7, 1999. Depending on the nature of some decisions, this may have been more appropriate than the Council would have thought.

He said the MPAC recommendations would follow up with a final recommendation to the Council on Wednesday, December 8, 1999. Then on Thursday, December 9, 1999, would be the Regional Transportation Summit with JPACT. He said he would be chair of that event, and Councilor Bragdon and Councilor Washington would serve on JPACT with him also. So there

was a quorum of the Council. Other Metro councilors were invited to attend, even though the actual actions would be limited to those Metro councilors who would actually vote by the request of some of the members. But they would try to make sure that everyone got to participate and everyone's input was taken into consideration.

He said then the process would come back to TPAC on December 14, 1999, and then to Council for final action by the end of the year. He said people should remember this was by resolution, it was not the ordinance. They were the resolutions. So the Council would have in place basically the grid, the framework. And starting in January, what the Council would do would be to go back and do all of the documentation work. Then the process would come forward in terms of a final ordinance probably five or six months later. So the Council would see it in a May or June 2000 time frame.

So the Council would have to prepare the findings for LCDC; deal with the transportation planning rule, the T21, and air quality and air mitigation requirements. They would also have to manage a two-step process that coordinated the transportation decisions with the 2040 Growth Concept, and where Metro was going with some of those decisions. So there would be a lot of refinements and a lot of time spent on the process. He said this was the final public hearing on this item as a resolution that was coming forward. He turned the process for today's public hearing back over to Presiding officer Monroe for today's public hearing.

Presiding Officer Monroe opened a public hearing on the Regional Transportation Plan. He reviewed the rule of the public hearing and called people forward for comment.

Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation/Coalition for a Livable Future, 1220 SW Morrison, Portland, OR, said they would be submitting extensive written testimony. He said there were many good elements in the RTP but he said he would focus today on some of their concerns, not the elements that they agreed with. He said that priorities should be given to existing communities and putting resources into those communities. He said the areas within the regional and town centers needed to have good transportation within those centers and for people in the immediate surrounding communities to get to those centers. The plan had far too much invested in new facilities at the edge of the region and on speeding people's commutes, whether it was from Clark County to Wilsonville or from Gresham to Hillsboro. His group didn't want to invest in providing people the opportunity to commute long distances. Instead, they wanted to invest in helping existing communities thrive, within the areas.

For example, he said the plan anticipated increased congestion within the town and regional centers. He said they would tolerate that in exchange for better transit and other opportunities for people to get around. However, at the same time the plan anticipated that the same congestion would be unacceptable outside the centers. He feared that defeated the purpose of the 2040 plan because it encouraged business to locate in areas where congestion would be relieved through increased transportation investments if it occurred. He didn't think that was a good idea. He said it was a basic flaw that should be reviewed in the plan.

Second, he said the strategic system was far too large to provide any kind of meaningful, direction or priorities for the region in terms of setting or deciding on individual transportation expenditures. It was almost four times the existing resources over the next 20 years. He said they didn't think that was realistic to expect that there would be those kinds of resources available. He said the gap was so large between what was actually available and what would be there. It wouldn't really provide the ability to make decisions and set priorities. He said the Council should send the plan back to JPACT. He said they should set both a reasonable budget and

priorities, in terms of exactly how the money ought to be spent. He said the Council should not be going to the public and promising one thing and delivering much less. It was a classic criticism of the government of over-promising and under-delivering in terms of what Metro would and could do. He noted the wonderful projects in the brochures and said most of them would never be built. He said some should be replaced with smaller projects that were more manageable.

He said the group had a long list of projects that they suggested be moved from the strategic plan to the preferred plan to reduce the strategic plan. The group he represented was opposed, in particular, to the Sunrise Freeway. He said it should be taken out of the RTP entirely. It would encourage development at the urban edge, sprawl and would take money from very important investments that needed to be made in Tigard and Beaverton in order to provide decent transportation in those existing communities.

Lynn Peterson, 1000 Friends of Oregon, said she was there today to focus on three things: (1) those things that they supported, (2) some suggested changes that they planned to propose language on, (3) and some further issues. She listed elements that they supported, elements of the RTP, programs and policies. They supported the boulevards. She said the street design standards they heartily support. She said as the Council knew, the last Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) cycle's \$19 million worth of projects was funded and she called that a success for the region. Street connectivity was a big part of the plan. It was a difficult goal to achieve but she thought Metro and the community could move forward with it. They supported the green corridors program and trying to create green corridors between the Portland metropolitan region land and neighboring cities outside the region. They also supported the green street program and the continued planning and support of light rail for the region.

She moved on and discussed something Mr. Williams discussed in his comments: the strategic system, our three big systems for the future. She mentioned the existing strategic and preferred plans. The strategic was four times larger than the existing resources. They had found it difficult to justify that, in terms of prioritization of projects. She said the RTP moved from a small amount of money to a much larger set of money. So how would the region prioritize? In the plan there was some talk about minor improvements over major improvements. The Oregon Highway Plan had some language like that. In 6.6.3 there was some discussion about that but it only applied to projects when it was an amendment to the RTP, not when it was moving from a little bit of money to a lot of money. She felt Metro didn't have that prioritization established in the plan. So she suggested changes to that. There was discussion about a "fix it first" policy. She said that needed to be stated up front in the strategic system – that was the region's first priority. It was not specifically stated as such, so she suggested that be changed.

Finally, as Councilor Kvistad noted, Metro would be adopting the RTP soon in December by resolution, not by ordinance, because they were outstanding issues. Her organization was very concerned about the outstanding issues. She said they were huge. She mentioned the Clean Air Act, conformity and the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) compliance. When the Council looked at the strategic system and how much larger it was than financially constrained or existing resources, her group was very worried about how the region would be able to justify such a large system. She was especially concerned in terms of the two regulations that were very important to the community.

Other outstanding issues she wanted to note in the back of the plan included the corridor planning. There were a lot of corridors called out for planning in the plan and really no way to do

it. There was really no funding mechanism or the staff capable of doing it. She said that was a barrier to implementation of the plan in the future.

Jim Howell, AORTA, 3325 NE 45th Ave Portland OR 97213, said he had submitted written testimony at one transportation listening post. He had not found it in the record so he was resubmitting that documentation today. He read his testimony into the record. (A copy of his written testimony can be found in this meeting record.) Mr. Howell also submitted an additional letter into the record.

He also added that approximately 10 years ago Citizens for Better Transit asked Metro to consider studying a transit intensive option. He said it still has not been done. He said until that was done, he didn't understand how Metro could pursue a plan that would increase vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) during the next 20 years, when he said it is possible to reduce VMTs by 10 percent. He said the public transit system is totally inadequate. The proposed bus plan in the RTPO lacked adequate frequencies, speed and critical linkages. He said it did not address the imminent problem of MAX not being able to handle the loads through downtown by that time (in the future). Much needed light rail corridors, like the Barber, are not even in the RTP. There was over 100 miles of rail line in metropolitan Portland serving primary travel corridors and they were not being considered in the RTP.

He said there were a lot of problems with the RTP. He suggested it was time to go back to the drawing board and consider a true public transit intensive plan. At least they can study and present it to the Council. Then the Council can decide whether transit intensive or some other plan is best. But until the transit plan option is completed and tested through the modeling process, Metro will never know what can be done.

Don Waggoner, Leuppod and Stevens, Inc, PO Box 600 Beaverton OR, spoke about the proposed 143rd overcrossing and his opposition to that plan. He read his written PowerPoint presentation into the record. He also provided pictures for the record. (The pictures and a copy of his presentation/written testimony can be found in this meeting record.)

Councilor Kvistad asked about the green line on the map. He asked if that was a line for the city.

Mr. Waggoner clarified that the green line represented BPA easement. He said it would go in between the two towers and would work. He showed on the map where the region could have an alternative overcrossing for just bicycles and pedestrians. He also identified the ESI and Weiss Scientific Glass Blowing buildings. He said there doesn't seem to be a good way of building an overcrossing in that area without causing a lot of trouble.

Steve Larrance, Citizens Against Irresponsible Growth, 20660 SW Kinnaman Rd Aloha OR 97007, said he was there today to submit into the record a DKS study commissioned by the city of Hillsboro. He planned on submitting copies of this study to the Metro councilors and including it in the public record next week. He said it was a drastic, different look at Shur, the South Hillsboro Urban Reserve Area. He said he wanted to discuss it today at the RTP public hearing because an important part of the RTP in that area is the concept of an expressway – the seven-mile expressway on TV Highway. He said it would change TV Highway. What it would do is make it a limited access facility and will impact the neighborhoods and businesses along that seven-mile section. The businesses that requested building permits for any minor work on the business would lose their access. He said there is no bigger negative impact to a property than losing access to it. What Metro is asking the community and Shur to do by adopting this is

just that. He said there is no real need to approve the TV Highway project right now, until the decision with the Shur Urban Reserve Area is made. The TV Highway severely limits access through aggressive access management. He said there has been no public notification of the property owners. He has received calls from businesses concerning what is going on and why they hadn't been notified by Metro. He said they were used to getting notification from the county. But this was a metro not a county process. People were very upset. Metro was lighting a short fuse on a bob out there. There were a lot of very concerned commercial property owners.

He also said it wouldn't work. A couple of years ago, Metro eliminated the western bi-pass and that was totally reliant on there being a connection to a widened Highway 217. That through connection was TV Highway. Under the proposed plan, if the Council looked at the other part of the change to the TV Highway/Canyon Road in the Hillsboro-Beaverton corridor, there will be in essence no through traffic through the Beaverton 2040 city center that would enable Metro and the region to make that connection. Neither the expressway nor the connection to Highway 217 would work, as planned. He said the Council decisions must stand together.

Councilor Kvistad said he, and some others, still hadn't given up hope that others will see the light and come forward to help him start a tractor...

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Lawrence what the role of the TV highway is. He asked if it is a regional connector or a strip zone.

Mr. Larrance responded that it was a regional connector. He said due to the congestion on Highway 26 right now, until capacity is added, it was the very best way. He said without it there was really no way to access the southern part of the county or the southern part of the region without going outside the urban growth boundary to make the trip. So by congesting Beaverton further with non-connectivity through the city center that was being proposed in 2040, the region would have no connections. So those trips would have no choice but to go 6 miles north to Highway 26 and contribute to the congestion there, in order to go 6 miles east and to go south again. He said it was a route that no one would choose. If Metro wanted to make a plan that created more outside the UGB trips the Council couldn't have done it in any better way than to cut off access east on TV Highway.

Councilor Atherton asked if Metro limited access on TV Highway would it help preserve its viability as a connector?

Mr. Larrance said it would. But he also said the only reason Metro would need to cut off access would be because they would be adding an incredible number of trips to it by adding the sure trips. He said there were other solutions. The list would be different if Metro does not add the Shur site to the UGB. So there was no need to bring forward the proposal right now. He said it was premature with the proposal to perform the corridor study now. He recommended waiting until the Shur site decisions were made. He said by adopting that decision a requirement for the local jurisdictions to start implementing the access management portion of it, which would be very dangerous. He said that will need to be done but in the future. There was access management over half of the corridor already that he was a major part of 18 years ago when the community plans were adopted. He said they eliminated 80 percent of the access points along the corridor. He said ODOT couldn't do it but they did it as a community effort. He said it could be done again to further enhance the carrying capacity. But what Metro was trying to do was basically two opposite functions. Metro was trying to create capacity on paper past the site and then put a wreck at either end of it by having it enter the 2040 city centers. It was really a non-plan and didn't make much sense.

Ray Polani, co-chair representing Citizen for Better Transit, 6110 SE Ankeny St. Portland, OR 97215-1245, submitted a letter addressed to the Transportation Policy Alternative Committee dated March 1990 to the record. He said that America was not running out of oil yet, but was running out of cheap oil. He referred to three articles from *Time* magazine. (A copy of his letter and the magazine articles can be found in this meeting record.) He said the community must change environmentally harmful transportation habits now. He added the buck would stop in the Portland regional area with the citizens and the RTP.

Presiding Officer Monroe closed the public hearing.

Councilor Kvistad recommended to the Council that it review the Transportation Committee agenda. It concerned not just the RTP but also the \$600 million bond program that they will be discussing at the transportation summit, the JPACT summit, the coming week. He said they would have discussions about a 100 percent list of projects to go forward to the state that would be funded. He said there had been debates about whether the Council should send a 100 percent list or a list that was a little bit more than 100 percent, based on the regional need as a request. He said that was something Metro wanted to have a discussion about.

Also, in terms of other transportation projects, the RTP programs would be broken into a couple of different sections. One would be consent items – things that had been generally recognized by all the players that were not items of concern or conflict. But there would also be discussions that took into consideration today's testimony, discussion at the transportation committee and elsewhere that would come forward that might be a bit more controversial. He asked that people remember it will not be simply the RTP, but will include those other issues. It would include some decisions on roads that could be some of the biggest decisions in the past couple of years.

Councilor McLain wanted to clarify the process of review of the transportation projects. She said there was the resolution coming up now, and the ordinance that she hoped to see in April, May or June of 2000. She said she understood that the conversation on some of these issues and concerns that people heard today would be allowed to bleed over into the time spent considering the ordinance.

Councilor Kvistad said it was similar to the Council's land use function, but a little bit different. They were trying to put in place in resolution form a package that will go through a filtering process where the Council looks at air quality, conformity, all the different things that were federal requirements for transportation funding to make sure all the pieces were together. He said those were the pieces that made up the final components of the resolution so it will clarify. As those come forward, the Council will have discussions if metro is not in conformity or there may be projects or changes that because of conformity issues are reviewed again. He said that was what the next couple of months would be about. He referred to what the Council had in front of them as the package or the general final list of what metro had on the table. But there would be some changes, major or minor, during the next six months.

METRO'S REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Metro's Regional Transportation Plan is supposed to be the region's transportation blueprint for the next 20 years. A future vision I do not share.

This plan is primarily an extensive laundry list of obsolete highway projects that individually may temporarily unsnarl some traffic bottle necks --- but collectively will promote more auto traffic. This in turn will create still larger more costly bottle necks to fix in the future. The public transit component is pitifully inadequate. It's more like a modest 5 year plan than a creative 20 year vision.

If approved and funded, this RTP will add over 600 lane miles of freeway and arterial traffic, cause peak hour congestion to more than double and result in a 2% increase in vehicle miles traveled per person (rather than the 10% decrease called for in the statewide planning goal). Also it will not cause a significant shift to public transit.

To solve our future transportation problems (problems that will be far worse if oil prices inflate faster than Metro has anticipated), we must control our temptation to expand an already bloated highway system and instead invest wisely in effective public transportation.

The core of an effective transit system is a rational, connected bus network providing 20-24 hour, 7 day a week service every 10-15 minutes. This service should be allowed to operate unimpeded by other traffic as much as possible.

*** The proposed bus plans in the RTP options lack adequate frequency, speed and critical linkages.**

In high demand corridors buses should be supplemented with rail service. This was the guiding principle that led to the construction of MAX. In fact the demand is growing so fast on MAX that within 10 to 15 years, longer trains will be needed to accommodate the peak rush.

Downtown will become a major light rail bottle neck. The traffic, short blocks and pedestrian activity are not compatible with longer trains and a subway will be needed by 2020.

* The imminent capacity problems on MAX are not addressed in the RTP.

Additional light rail will be needed, especially on the Barbur and North/South Corridors. A line between Oregon City and Vancouver should have been under construction by now.

Unfortunately Metro planners, in their zeal to accommodate political interests, proposed extending the line into areas of low demand, far north into Clark County and to Clackamas Town Center which triggered voter disapproval in these counties.

* A much needed Barbur light rail line is not in the RTP yet Metro planners continue proposing Clackamas Town Center as a prime destination in spite of public rejection.

Commuter rail service is an excellent way to alleviate peak hour congestion in major travel corridors. In addition it can provide fast convenient all day access to outlying communities such as Newberg, McMinnville, Canby, Woodburn, Camas, Longview, Forest Grove, Wilsonville and Salem. The proposed Beaverton to Wilsonville commuter line, if extended to Milwaukie, would be good short term start of a commuter rail system.

* Over 100 miles of rail lines in the metropolitan area serving primary travel corridors are not being considered for passenger service in the RTP.


Within the next 20 years, a new multimodal transportation station should be considered on the east side, probably near the Rose Quarter, where convenient intermodal connections can be made between long distance trains, regional high speed trains, commuter trains, light rail trains, intercity buses, local buses and even airplanes, (by providing ticketing and baggage handling services as a complement to the excellent light rail access soon to be provided to the airport).

If the proposed Regional Transportation Plan is the blueprint for improving the regions transportation system in the next 20 years, then this blueprint needs to go back to the drawing board for some extensive revisions.

Jim Howell



3325 NE 45th Ave., Portland OR 97213, 284-7182



CITIZENS for BETTER TRANSIT

To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, March 1990

From: Ray Polani

Subject: Request for a study of a Transit Intensive Regional Transportation Plan to be included in the fiscal year 1991 Unified Work Program

The proposed study would develop the base data needed to produce a Transit Intensive Regional Transportation Plan. This contingency plan would be invaluable in the event of sudden changes in national transportation priorities. Possible sizeable increases in fuel prices and diversion of federal transportation funds to more pressing national needs could raise havoc with our current highway intensive transportation plan. A relatively low-cost, fuel efficient transit strategy could save our area from a future mobility crisis.

The modest amount of funds needed to develop this plan now, could save valuable time and resources later on. It also would be a valuable tool to evaluate light rail and highway projects in the context of the current Regional Transportation Plan.

Study Elements.

1. Improved and expanded transit network design
 - a. Improved bus network (routing, headways and preferential treatment)
 - b. Additional high capacity corridors (LRT)
 - c. New circumferential corridors (Bus, Railbus, LRT)
 - d. Commuter service beyond metro area (rail, Bus)
2. Travel demand forecast using input from improved and expanded transit network design
 - a. Modify base highway network to exclude highways not currently in place and include "phantom lines" to replicate transit corridors not in the highway network. This assumes travel demand will change as a result of providing superior transit facilities between zones not served well by the highway network.
 - b. Make land use assumptions that concentrate a high percentage of projected growth within walking distance of the rail stations. (During the past 30 years, 50% of Toronto's apartment construction and 90% of its office development has occurred within walking distance of its metro system).

3. Input the travel forecast model with transit supportive assumptions.
 - a. Moderate fares
 - b. Parking costs highest near the rail system
 - c. High auto operating costs (due to increased fuel, parking and registration)
 - d. Constrained auto traffic flow consistent with existing capacity
 - e. Unreliability factor for corridors of constrained flow (due to accidents, breakdowns)
 - f. Comfort and reliability factor for rail travel
4. Research availability of existing regional rail corridors for passengers and freight use
 - a. Negotiated purchase
 - b. Condemnation
 - c. Joint use agreements
5. Develop costs for this transit intensive alternative
 - a. Capital (right-of-way, fixed infrastructure, rolling stock)
 - b. Operating (cost less projected farebox revenue)

We agree that many of the assumptions made in a transit intensive scenario are not realistic in the present political climate, but we believe the approved regional transportation plan is also not realistic given many obvious global trends. Political reality will move in the direction of more transit the way it is already happening in California, the heart of the auto-dependent culture of today.

This plan will help set the upper limit of what can be expected from transit intensive development so that future decision makers will have a broader spectrum of options to choose from as national priorities change.

For the financing of the study we recommend that 2%-3% of Metro's Fiscal 1991 planning budget be diverted to this critical project (\$ 100- \$150,000).

WILL WE RUN OUT OF

BY MARK HERTSGAARD

No, we'll have plenty of carbon-based fuel to see

THE METAPHORICAL ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE literal, but the literal is irresistibly short: No, unfortunately not. Humans will have at our disposal as much gasoline as we can burn in the 21st century. Nor are we likely to run out of heating oil, coal or natural gas, the other carbon-based fuels that have powered industrial civilization for 200 years.

Why won't we run out? And why is that unfortunate? After all, these fuels provide nearly 80% of the energy humans use to keep warm, to light buildings and run computers, to power the cars that get us around, the tractors that plant food, the hospitals that serve our sick. If these fuels were to vanish tomorrow, worldwide chaos would follow and humans would die in the hundreds of millions.

So why not rejoice at having lots of fuel to burn? Let me try to answer that by telling you about my friend Zhenbing.

I met Zhenbing in China in 1996, near the end of a six-year journey around the world to write a book about humanity's environmental future. A 30-year-old economics professor who was liked on sight by virtually everyone he met, Zhenbing was my interpreter during five weeks of travel throughout China. A born storyteller, he often recalled his childhood in a tiny village northwest of Beijing. Like most Chinese peasants of that era, Zhenbing's parents were too poor to buy coal. Instead, in a climate like

Boston's, where winter temperatures often plunged below zero, they burned dried leaves to heat their mud hut. Their home's inside walls were often white with frost from November to April.

In 1980, China's economic reforms began putting enough money in people's pockets to enable even peasants like Zhenbing's parents to buy coal. Today coal supplies 73% of China's energy, and there is enough beneath the country to last an additional 300 years at current consumption rates. Plainly, that is good news in one respect. Burning coal has made the Chinese people (somewhat) warm in winter for the first time in their history. But multiply Zhenbing's story by China's huge population, and you understand why 9 of the world's 10 most air-polluted cities are found in China and why nearly 1 of every 3 deaths there is linked to the horrific condition of the air and water.

Equally alarming is what China's coal burning is doing to the planet as a whole. China has become the world's second largest pro-




Photo-illustration for TIME by Jody Dore

GAS ?

see us through the next century. That's the problem

ducer of the greenhouse gases that cause global warming, and it will be No. 1 by 2020 if it triples coal consumption as planned. But the U.S., the other environmental superpower, has no right to point a finger. Americans lead the world in greenhouse-gas production, mainly because of their ever tightening addiction to the car, the source of almost 40% of U.S. emissions.

Which returns us to gasoline and its source, petroleum. The earth's underground stores of petroleum are not quite as ample as those of coal or natural gas, but there is enough to supply humanity for many decades, even with rising population and living standards. Crippling shortages may still occur, of course. But they will arise from skulduggery or incompetence on the part of corporations or governments, not from any physical scarcity.

"Will we run out of gas?"—a question we began asking during the oil shocks of the 1970s—is now the wrong question. The earth's supply of carbon-based fuels will last a long time. But if humans burn anywhere near that much carbon, we'll burn up the planet, or at least our place on it.

Change won't be easy. But how we respond will help answer the metaphorical meaning of "Will we run out of gas?" That is, will our species fizzle out in the coming century, a victim of its own appetites and

lethargy? Or will we take action and earn a longer stay on this beautiful planet?

The good news is, we know how to change course.


Improving energy efficiency is the first step and—surprise!—potentially a very profitable one, not just for consumers and businesses but also for all of society. And better efficiency can buy us time to make a global transition to solar power and other renewable energy.

China could use 50% less energy if it only installed more efficient electric lights, motors and insulation, all technologies currently available on the world market. Americans could trade in their notoriously gas-swilling suvs for sporty new 80-m.p.g. hybrid-electric cars. Better yet: hydrogen-powered fuel-cell cars, expected in showrooms by 2004. Since their only exhaust is water vapor, fuel-cell cars produce neither smog nor global warming.

The best part is that we could make money by making peace with the planet. If governments launched a program—call it a Global Green Deal—to environmentally retrofit our civilization from top to bottom, they could create the biggest business enterprise of the next 25 years, a huge source of jobs and profits.

Which is why I'm not entirely gloomy about our future. After all, what's more human than pursuit of self-interest? ■

Mark Hertsgaard's most recent book is *Earth Odyssey: Around the World in Search of Our Environmental Future*



HOW HOT

BY JAMES TREFIL

radiation for a while and warming the surface. The molecules are similar to the glass in a greenhouse, which is why the warming process is called the greenhouse effect.

The greenhouse effect is nothing new; it has been operating ever since the earth formed. Without it, the surface of the globe would be a frigid -20°C (-4°F), the oceans would have frozen, and no life would have developed. So the issue we face in the next millennium is not whether there will be a greenhouse effect, but whether humans, by burning fossil fuels, are adding enough carbon dioxide to the atmosphere to change it (and our climate) in significant ways.

You might think that, knowing what causes greenhouse warming, it would be an easy matter to predict how hot the world will be in the next century. Unfortunately, things aren't that simple. The world is a complex place, and reducing it to the climatologist's tool of choice—the computer model—isn't easy. Around almost every statement in the greenhouse debate is a penumbra of uncertainty that results from our current inability to capture the full complexity of the planet in our models.

There is one fact, though, that everyone agrees on: the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is increasing steadily. It is near 360 parts per million today, vs. 315 p.p.m. in 1958 (when modern measurements started) and 270 p.p.m. in preindustrial times (as measured by air bubbles trapped in the Greenland ice sheet).

An analysis of admittedly spotty temperature records indicates that the world's average temperature has gone up about 0.5°C (1°F) in the past century, with the '90s being the hottest decade in recent history. This fact is quoted widely in the scientific community, although there are nagging doubts even among researchers. Recent satellite records, using different kinds of instrumentation, fail to show a warming trend.

If we accept that there has been moderate warming, we turn to computer models to see if humans are to blame and what will happen to the earth's climate in the future. These models are complex because climate depends on thousands of things, from Antarctic sea ice to sub-Saharan soil conditions. While the electronic simulations are monuments to the ingenuity and perseverance of their creators, they provide us with, at best, a fuzzy view of the future. They have difficulty handling factors like clouds and ocean currents (two major influences on climate), and if you fed the climate of 1900 into any of them, they couldn't predict the climatic history of the 20th century. Like everything else in this frustrating field, the models' limitations force us to make important decisions in the face of imperfect knowledge.

The most authoritative predictions about future warming come from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a worldwide

Photo-illustrations for TIME by 2Face



NOT SO LONG AGO, PEOPLE TALKED ABOUT global warming in apocalyptic terms—imagining the Statue of Liberty up to its chin in water or an onslaught of tropical diseases in Oslo. Recently, however, advances in our understanding of climate have moved global warming from a subject for a summer disaster movie to a serious but manageable scientific and policy issue.

Here's what we know. Since sunlight is always falling on the earth, the laws of physics decree that the planet has to radiate the same amount of energy back into space to keep the books balanced. The earth does this by sending infrared radiation out through the atmosphere, where an array of molecules (the best known is carbon dioxide) form a kind of blanket, holding outgoing

in the past decade we have experienced SEVEN of the TEN warmest years on record

No one knows for sure, but the potential perils of climate change make it unwise for us to ignore the greenhouse effect

WILL IT GET ?

consortium of more than 2,000 climate scientists. The current forecast is that by 2100 the earth's temperature will go up 1° to 3.5°C (2° to 7°F), with the best guess being an increase of 2°C (4°F).

At the lower end of this predicted warming range, the temperature rise would take us back to the conditions that existed between A.D. 950 and 1350, when the climate was 1°C (2°F) warmer than it is now. This time period is regarded as one of the most benign weather regimes in history. To find temperature swings at the upper end, you have to go back 10,000 years, to when the earth was exiting the last Ice Age. Temperatures during the Ice Age were 5°C (10°F) cooler than they are now, and there was a series of incidents during which global temperatures changed as much as 10°F in a matter of decades. If that were to happen now, expanding oceans might flood coastlines and generate fiercer storms. And as weather patterns changed, some places could get wetter and some dryer, and the ranges of diseases could expand. Civilization has seen—and endured—such changes in the past, but they may come much more swiftly this time, making it harder to withstand the jolts.

The main reason for the spread in the IPCC predictions is uncertainty about how much carbon dioxide will be added to the atmosphere by human activity, because how we will respond to the threat of climate warming is the greatest imponderable of all. We can probably develop technologies to deal with excess carbon—some scientists talk about removing it from smokestacks and stashing it underground—but the most direct way to control carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is not to put it there in the first place. This is the point of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol—signed by 84 nations but not ratified by the U.S. Senate—which would limit developed countries' carbon emissions from cars, power plants and other major users of fossil fuels.

It makes no sense to overreact to the prospect of global warming, but it makes no sense to ignore it either. A prudent policy that stresses conservation and alternate energy sources seems to me to be wise insurance in an uncertain age. After all, our grandchildren will thank us for developing high-mileage cars, energy-efficient appliances and cheap solar energy, no matter how the future of global warming plays out. ■

James Trefil is a George Mason University physics professor and author of 101 Things You Don't Know About Science and No One Else Does Either

... AND THEN HOW COLD?

Warming may affect sea currents, triggering an ice age

It seems obvious that trapping more of the sun's heat will make the planet hotter. But what seems obvious isn't always true. According to some respected scientists, there's a chance that global warming could plunge us into, of all things, an ice age.

The argument hinges on the Gulf Stream, the ocean current that brings warm surface water north and east and heats Europe. As it travels, some of the water evaporates; what's left is saltier and thus denser. Eventually the dense surface water sinks to the sea bottom, where it flows back southward. And then, near the equator, warm, fresh water from tropical rivers and rain dilutes the salt once again, allowing the water to rise to the surface, warm up and begin flowing north again.

But with global warming, melting ice from Greenland and the Arctic Ocean could pump fresh water into the North Atlantic; so could the increased rainfall predicted for northern latitudes in a warmer world. Result: the Gulf Stream's water wouldn't get saltier after all and wouldn't sink so easily. Without adequate resupply, the southerly underwater current would stop, and the Gulf Stream would in turn be shut off.

If that happens, Europe will get very cold. Rome is, after all, at the same latitude as Chicago, and Paris is about as far north as North Dakota. More snow will fall, and the bright snow cover will reflect more of the sun's energy back into space, making life even chillier. Beyond that, the Gulf Stream is tied into other ocean currents, and shutting it down could rearrange things in a way that would cause less overall evaporation. Because atmospheric H₂O is an important greenhouse gas, its loss would mean even more dramatic cooling—a total of perhaps as much as 8°C (17°F).

Worst of all, the experts believe, such changes could come on with astonishing speed—perhaps within a decade or less. And while we might have a great deal of trouble adjusting to a climate that gets 2°C (4°F) warmer over the next century, an ice age by midcentury would be unimaginably devastating. The lingering uncertainty about whether our relentless production of greenhouse gases will keep heating our planet or ultimately cool it suggests that we should make a better effort to leave the earth's thermostat alone.

—By Michael D. Lemonick



In the last ICE AGE, about 18,000 years ago, glaciers came as far south as Pittsburgh

WHAT WOULD A GREEN FUTURE LOOK LIKE?


By the year 2025 many of us will no longer tolerate the scourges of 20th century suburban life: the marathon commutes, the maddening traffic jams, the pollution spewing from tailpipes and chimneys. We'll demand neighborhoods where the air is pristine and places to work, shop and play are close at hand

WORK / TRANSPORT

Lots of us will work in our houses or apartments ①, telecommuting with our computers. Others will make a short hop to a nearby office park ②. Those who have to go downtown will prefer swift mass transit ③. Cars and trucks ④ will still be used, but they will run on clean, hydrogen-powered fuel cells. To keep ourselves in shape and save money, we'll spend more time on bicycles ⑤

FOOD

We'll favor fruits, grains and vegetables grown close to home, either in our backyard gardens ⑥ or on nearby organic farms ⑦. It won't take much energy to get the fresh produce to local markets. Since the farms will employ natural forms of pest control rather than potentially toxic chemicals, there will be much less of a buildup of suspected carcinogens in the food supply



SHOPPING

Even in an era of online marketing, there may still be a mall ①, but it will be relatively small and easy to get to, with sidewalks and bike racks instead of a mammoth parking lot. An airy place where a flood of natural light will cut down on energy use, the mall will be a two-way operation: when you're through using any product you buy there, the stores will be required to take it back for recycling

ENERGY

Our power will come from sources cleaner than fossil fuels. Some energy will flow from modern-day windmills ⑦, but much of it will be generated in our own homes. Rooftop solar panels ⑩ will supply electricity to our appliances and to a basement fuel cell ⑪, which will produce hydrogen. When the sun is not shining, the cell will operate in reverse, using the hydrogen to make electricity

WASTE

Sewage will be piped into enclosed marshes ⑫, where selected plants, fish, snails and microbes will purify the wastewater before it enters streams and reservoirs. No longer will inadequate treatment of wastewater promote algal blooms that threaten other aquatic life

BY CHARLES P. ALEXANDER
ILLUSTRATION BY DON FOLEY

PROPOSED 143 rd OVERCROSSING

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

2

WHERE IS IT?

- **JUST WEST OF SUNSET HIGH SCHOOL**
- **AT THE EASTERN END OF CORNELL OAKS**
- **CONNECTING 143rd AT CORNELL ROAD THROUGH SCIENCE PARK DRIVE AND MEADOW DRIVE TO WALKER ROAD (AT THE NORTHERN ENTRANCE TO NIKE)**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

3

IT WILL NOT PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT BENEFITS

- **IT DOES NOT REDUCE TRAFFIC ON CORNELL ROAD @ 143RD AT ALL (0%)**
- **IT REDUCES TRAFFIC ON MURRAY INTERCHANGE BY ONLY 7%**
- **IT REDUCES TRAFFIC ON CORNELL INTERCHANGE BY ONLY 8%**
- **IT CAN NOT DELIVER TRUE NORTH/SOUTH CONNECTIVITY BECAUSE OF THE BARRIER OF THE NIKE CAMPUS AT ITS SOUTHERN END**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

4

IT IMPACTS EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

- **IT INCREASES TRAFFIC ON GREENBRIER PARKWAY BY 90% OVER DESIGNED LEVELS**
- **IT GREATLY CHANGES CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ON MEADOW DRIVE DUE TO INCREASED TRAFFIC**
- **IT WOULD CAUSE THE DEMOLITION OF WEISS SCIENTIFIC GLASS BLOWING BUILDING**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

5

ADDITIONAL IMPACTS ON EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

- **IT INCREASES TRAFFIC FLOWS ON
SCIENCE PARK DRIVE**
- **IT DRAMATICALLY REDUCES THE
UTILITY OF PROPERTY PURCHASED BY
LEUPOLD & STEVENS INC. FOR FUTURE
EXPANSION.**
- **THIS COULD PUT A BLACK CLOUD OVER
ANY PLANS FOR THEIR EXPANSION**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

6

IT IS VERY EXPENSIVE

- **IT IS CURRENTLY PROJECTED TO
COST \$15,000,000**
- **THIS WILL PROBABLY BE A LOW
ESTIMATE**
- **MUCH BETTER USES OF FUNDS
ARE ALMOST CERTAINLY
AVAILABLE**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

7

ALTERNATIVE OF POWERLINE BEAVERTON TRAILCORRIDOR STUDY -RTP PROJECT NO 3014

- **IT WOULD PROVIDE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS NORTH/SOUTH (TWO PARTS OF THE MULTI MODAL SOLUTION)**
- **IT WOULD COST FAR LESS AT \$2,700,000**
- **THERE WOULD BE NO NEGATIVE AND MANY POSITIVE IMPACTS TO EXISTING BUSINESSES AND NEIGHBORHOODS**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999


8




IN SUMMARY



- **THERE WOULD BE VERY LITTLE POSITIVE BENEFIT GAINED**
- **THERE ARE LARGE NEGATIVE IMPACTS ON EXISTING BUSINESS AND NEIGHBORING RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY**
- **IT WOULD BE VERY EXPENSIVE**
- **IT IS AN IDEA WHICH SHOULD BE REJECTED**

RTP PROJECT NO. 3187 - 143rd OVERCROSSING-DECEMBER 2, 1999

9







ENTER INTO RECORD FOR

1) RTP UPDATE

2) SHUR UGB
AMENDMENTS

SUBMITTED BY:
STEVE LAMARCA FOR
CALG

South Hillsboro Urban Reserve Areas Transportation Review

Prepared for

Washington County

Prepared by

DKS Associates

September 13, 1999

DKS Associates

921 S. W. Washington Street, Suite 612
Portland, OR 97205-2824
Phone: (503) 243-3500
Fax: (503) 243-1934

September 14, 1999

Mr. Andy Back, Senior Planner
Washington County
Land Use and Transportation Department
155 North First Avenue
Hillsboro, OR 97124

**Subject: Transportation Review for the South Hillsboro Urban Reserve Areas
#51 through 55 in the City of Hillsboro, Oregon**

Dear Andy,


DKS Associates is pleased to submit this final report to Washington County for its use in the ongoing review of the South Hillsboro Plan Area. We have enclosed four printed copies and one unbound original document for your use.

We have enjoyed working closely with you and the project team in developing our approach to assessing the transportation impacts of this important area. This final report reflects comments made by the City of Hillsboro and Mr. Steve Larrance on our July 30, 1999 Draft Final report.

We would be glad to present or discuss these findings with staff or the county commissioners at your discretion. If you have any further questions or comments, please call me.

Sincerely,

DKS Associates, Inc.



Carl D. Springer, P.E.
Project Manager

Cc: Wink Brooks, City of Hillsboro (1 copy)
Wayne Kittelson, Kittelson & Associates (1 copy)
Tom Lancaster, Lancaster Engineering (1 copy)
Steve Larrance (1 copy)
Scott Higgins, Metro (1 copy)




Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	1
TRAVEL DEMAND FORECAST	4
APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	4
METHODOLOGY	4
STREET NETWORK AND CONNECTIVITY.....	5
ON-SITE NETWORK.....	5
OFF-SITE NETWORK.....	5
LAND DEVELOPMENT ASSUMPTIONS	6
COMPARISON OF PLAN AREA TO SELECTED METRO COMMUNITIES	8
EXPECTED TRAVEL ACTIVITY.....	10
TRIP GENERATION METHODOLOGY	10
TOTAL TRIP GENERATION.....	11
RETAIL PASS-BY TRIPS.....	11
INTERNAL TRIPS.....	11
NET ADDED VEHICLE TRIPS	12
ADOPTED MODEL REFINEMENTS	14
FUTURE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	15
2020 TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTS.....	15
TRIP DISTRIBUTION.....	15
TWO-HOUR 2020 TRAVEL FORECASTS.....	18
SYSTEM IMPACT ANALYSIS	21
FINDINGS.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: SHUR NET VEHICLE TRIPS OFF-SITE	2
TABLE 2: OFF-SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION DURING PEAK HOURS	2
TABLE 3: CONCEPT PLAN AREA LAND DEVELOPMENT (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE).....	7
TABLE 4: COMPARISON OF PLAN DESCRIPTION TO METRO ALLOCATION	7
TABLE 6: LAND USE ALLOCATIONS FOR SELECTED METRO AREAS.....	9
TABLE 7: COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHIC RATIOS FOR SELECTED METRO AREAS	9
TABLE 7: TOTAL VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION FOR SOUTH HILLSBORO PLAN AREA	11
TABLE 8: NET VEHICLE TRIPS OFF-SITE FOR SOUTH HILLSBORO PLAN AREA.....	12
TABLE 9: VEHICLE TRIP SUMMARY FOR SELECTED METRO AREAS	13
TABLE 10: VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY FOR SOUTH HILLSBORO AREA.....	14
TABLE 11: PERCENT OF SITE TRAFFIC CROSSING SELECTED SCREEN LINES	15
TABLE 12: OFF-SITE PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION ON SELECTED ROAD FACILITIES	17
TABLE 13: SITE TRAFFIC VOLUMES IMPACTS RELATIVE TO 2020 TOTAL TRAFFIC.....	19
TABLE 14: 2020 SITE TRAFFIC VOLUMES RELATIVE TO 2020 BACKGROUND VOLUMES	20
TABLE 15: 2020 ROADWAY LINK IMPACT ANALYSIS	22

APPENDICES

- A: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS IN STUDY AREA (ROUND 2, 4/16/99)**
- B: RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE**
- C: TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS**
- D: EMME/2 TRAFFIC VOLUME PLOTS, 2020 2-HOUR PM PEAK**
- E: TECHNICAL COMPARISON WITH CITY OF HILLSBORO SHUR ANALYSIS**

Introduction and Summary

Introduction

DKS Associates has completed its review of the system-level transportation impacts associated with the South Hillsboro Urban Reserves (SHUR) Area. The study purpose was to provide the Washington County Board of County Commissioners and their staff with an independent review of the city's transportation plan and system impact assessment.

The City of Hillsboro and the consultant that performed the initial transportation planning for the Concept Plan collaborated in milestone meetings to guide the study direction. The approaches taken by DKS Associates for estimating travel activity and impacts of the SHUR was based on published data for large mixed-use developments and on Metro travel data for comparable neighborhoods around the metropolitan area.

Summary of Findings

The following discussion highlight the major findings of this technical analysis.

- **Regional Network Congested with Current Funding Programs Regardless of Urban Reserve Development** – The 2020 peak period travel demands will exceed system capacity on several regional facilities near the subject site. Cornelius Pass Road, 185th Avenue, Farmington Road and particularly TV Highway will have peak hour travel demands above planned capacity given the set of improvements described by Metro in their Existing Resources Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The high travel demand will occur whether or not the urban reserve lands are developed, although SHUR development will exacerbate these conditions. The most severe conditions on TV Highway extend from Brookwood Avenue east to Highway 217 and include the northern frontage of the South Hillsboro site.
- **SHUR Generates 7,500 New Vehicle Trips on Local and Regional Facilities** — The net new traffic added to the regional street system will be approximately 7,500 vehicle trips in the p.m. peak hour if the SHUR develops as conceived in the city's concept area plan. This trip generation value accounts for internal traffic (1,000 trips) and pass-by traffic (400 trips) that may use the new commercial facilities within SHUR. The trip generation estimates for SHUR are summarized below in Table 1.

Table 1: SHUR Net Vehicle Trips Off-Site

<i>Description</i>	<i>Daily Trips</i>	<i>PM In</i>	<i>PM Out</i>	<i>PM Total</i>
Total Vehicle Trips	87,281	5,254	3,649	8,904
Less Retail Pass-By Trips (30%)		-199	-215	-414
Less Internal Trips (11%)		-578	-401	-979
Net Vehicle Trips Generated		4,477	3,033	7,510

- **SHUR Travel Patterns Predominantly North and East of Urban Reserves** – The Metro model travel forecasts showed about three-quarters of SHUR traffic during peak hours will use road facilities north and east of the site. Travel to and from the west will be approximately 18 percent, and the remaining 6 percent will use facilities to and from the south. The table below summarizes the trip distribution in the cardinal directions and notes the major arterial facilities used for this travel.

Table 2: Off-Site Trip Distribution during Peak Hours

<i>Travel To and From</i>	<i>Arterial Facilities</i>	<i>Percent of Site Trips</i>
North	Brookwood Avenue Century Boulevard Cornelius Pass Road 185 th Avenue	38%
East	TV Highway Farmington Road	38%
West	TV Highway Baseline Road	18%
South	River Road Farmington Road 209 th Avenue	6%

- **Pending Metro Performance Standards Applied** – The 2-hour peak period level of service criteria recommended in the by Metro in the Draft Regional Transportation Plan was applied to evaluate transportation system performance. This criterion uses a 2-hour peak period travel demand forecast and, at a minimum, it accepts one hour at LOS E and one hour at LOS F conditions. This is a departure from county performance standards.
- **Off-Site Impacts with Urban Reserve Development** – The road facilities primarily impacted by urban reserve development are TV Highway, Cornelius Pass Road, and Century Boulevard, Farmington Road and 209th Avenue. If substantial capacity improvements are not made to TV Highway (as provided in Metro's Strategic Funding RTP), the impacts will also affect its parallel facilities including Alexander, Johnson, Blanton, and Kinnaman.
- **Metro Strategic RTP Improvements Could Serve Most of the Travel Demands Even With Urban Reserve Development** – The system improvements contained in the Spring 1999 Strategic Funding RTP street network mitigates most of the congested facilities during peak periods. The Metro suggested improvements on TV Highway would create

an expressway facility similar to Highway 212 in Milwaukie and Highway 99E near Tacoma Avenue with roadway over-crossings, grade-separated interchanges, and very limited access to adjoining land. The Draft Strategic RTP allocates \$33.2 million for this improvement. Additional costs for land acquisition and business impact requirements could increase the total project to over \$100 million.

- **TV Highway Improvements Require Further Study** – The suggested Metro recommendation for an expressway facility on TV Highway has not been studied by ODOT, Washington County or either affected city and these solutions have not been adopted into their respective transportation plans. Further study of the TV Highway Corridor is needed to document the specific needs and to develop a preferred alternative. This investigation would balance the benefits of high capacity street improvements assumed in the Strategic RTP and the costs of such improvements including the impacts to existing and planned land development (both takings and access modifications).

Travel Demand Forecast

Approach and Methodology

The primary tools used in this review was the 2020 travel demand models developed by Metro staff that forecast two-hour peak period travel volumes. Two alternative road system networks were included in the evaluation:

- Existing Resource Network – This network relies on current funding sources and programs to add system capacity. In Washington County, this is largely limited to MSTIP funded projects.
- Strategic Network – This network includes many additional system improvements that were identified by Metro and local agency staff that will be needed to serve forecasted 2020 activity levels. These additional improvements in the study area are summarized in the RTP list in *Appendix A*. Possible funding programs for the added improvements have not been identified.

The cost estimates shown in the RTP are preliminary and do not include land acquisition or business impact requirements. The recent Farmington Road improvement project demonstrated that associated costs for land acquisition and business impact requirements can substantially increase the total project costs relative to street improvement costs. Farmington Road cost \$17 million to widen for 1.3 miles (\$13 million per mile). The TV Highway expressway project in the Strategic Network (#3025) is six miles long and it includes several new grade-separated structures. The total costs could exceed \$100 million.

Methodology

The Metro regional model is a comprehensive travel demand forecasting tool for the Portland Metropolitan Area that follows the four-step modeling process¹ and actually consists of a series of individual models that have been calibrated to represent regional travel activity. Our review focused on the following specific elements of the modeling process as they apply to the South Hillsboro Concept Plan Area:

- street capacity and connectivity,
- land development, and
- expected travel activity (total vehicle trips, percent of internal trips, etc.).

¹ The traditional four-step travel demand forecast modeling process involves estimating trip generation (person trip ends), trip distribution (pairs of person trip ends around the region), travel mode (mode of transport – auto, truck, transit, etc.), and trip assignment (route taken to complete trip).

Street Network and Connectivity

The 2020 Existing Resources and Strategic Auto networks were reviewed for the planning area to compare it with the local transportation system envisioned in the concept plan. The plan area is described by four traffic analysis zones (TAZ 244 through 248). Also included in the 2020 model networks are Tri-Met transit services including the Westside light rail train service, and local and regional bus services. A higher frequency bus service on TV Highway is included in both networks.

On-Site Network

The original model networks were compared to the proposed concept plan area street system per the city's report. The most recent model network (4/16/99) has incorporated the plan area's higher-level streets (community street, regional boulevard) with moderate free-flow speeds (35 mph) and hourly vehicle capacity (900 vehicle per hour). These designations are consistent with three-lane minor arterial and major collector facilities found elsewhere in the study area (Brookwood Avenue, Francis Street, Lois Street). The planned function of the new on-site streets are summarized below:

East-West Street Connections: On-site street facilities in the concept plan connect to several east-west collector and minor arterial facilities that parallel Tualatin Valley Highway. This will enable site vehicle traffic to better use alternative routes to TV Highway and lessen the peak hour demands that would otherwise be added to that facility. The on-site east-west streets connect to existing streets including SW Blanton Street, SW Kinnaman Road, SE Alexander and SE Davis.

North-South Street Connections: The existing railroad service immediately south of TV Highway severely restricts new street access from the plan area. North-south connections are shown to SW Cornelius Pass Road, Century Boulevard, and SW Brookwood Avenue.

The model's transportation network does not include the commuter rail or street car components that are suggested as options in the preferred concept area plan. These public transit elements require co-ordination with agencies and lands outside of the concept plan area, and, to date, they have not been incorporated into either the transportation system plan for Hillsboro or the latest Regional Transportation Plan improvements. These are distinguished from the above street improvements that can be planned, funded and constructed entirely within the bounds of the planning area.

Overall, the on-site street elements of the 2020 model networks appear to reasonably represent the preferred concept plan circulation system. The following network modifications were made:

- Blanton Street was extended westerly to connect with the southerly extension of Cornelius Pass Road.
- The concept plan area were subdivided from four to nine TAZs to isolate development outside of the plan boundary (just south of TV Highway) and to add more definition to the plan area.

Off-Site Network

No new off-site street system improvements were considered outside of the concept plan area beyond those currently envisioned in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with the few corrections noted below. The analysis evaluates the impacts of the concept plan on the

transportation system given the existing system and planned improvements that are identified in the latest RTP².

TV Highway – One of the more substantial RTP street improvements on the Strategic network was along TV Highway between 10th Street in Hillsboro and Cedar Hills Boulevard in Beaverton. The improvement would more than double capacity from 2,150 vehicle per hour (vph) in each direction today to 4,500 vph after the improvement. (See letter from Metro to Washington County with this improvement recommendation and ODOT's letter to Metro regarding TV Highway in *Appendix B*)

This RTP project is not explicitly contained in the state, county or city transportation plans. The county plan calls for seven-lanes on TV Highway in this area, and the city plan notes that by 2015 TV Highway will be close to capacity (this review focuses on 2020 horizon year). ODOT has not adopted such improvements into their regional plan but they recognize the need for improved access management.

In order to achieve 4,500 vehicles per hour capacity, significant access changes must occur in the TV Highway Corridor. The model assumes three interchange treatments, four or five flyovers or underpasses and five or six "right in, right out" locations between Brookwood Avenue and Hocken Avenue. All other roads and business driveways would be cut-off from direct access to TV Highway. Between Brookwood Avenue and 198th Avenue, one interchange, two flyovers and two "right in, right outs" are assumed. Further refinement study is needed to fully document the capacity needs, and to develop alternative measures to increase corridor capacity. The suggested expressway concept by Metro is only one possible solution. Other alternatives could include improved capacity and connectivity of parallel roads, and other locations for grade separations and access controls.

At a planning level, access changes of this magnitude are necessary to achieve the high capacity assumed in the model. The precise access elements and their locations should be identified in a more detailed corridor study. However, near the South Hillsboro Urban Reserve, this level of capacity cannot be achieved with at-grade intersections.

Miscellaneous Corrections – Based on input from city and county staff regarding network corrections, the following network modifications were made:

- **Farmington Road** – The Existing Resource network was showed 1800 vph capacity west of 185th Avenue where no planned improvements are identified. This was corrected to be 900 vph.
- **Century Boulevard** – The segment between Evergreen Road and Cornell Road was added to the both networks, and the segment between Evergreen Road across US 26 to Jacobson Road was added to the Strategic Auto network. These revisions will be incorporated into the next round of RTP network improvements.

Land Development Assumptions

The proposed concept plan land development is distributed around three major neighborhoods on-site: Butternut Creek, Ladd-Reed, and Gordon Creek. The specific allocations for each neighborhood are not identified in the concept plan, but the overall mix of development is summarized below in Table 3. The South Hillsboro Urban Reserve plan area includes up to 8,500 new residential dwelling units, one middle school, two elementary schools, and over 600,000 square feet of building area for office, industrial and commercial uses.

² *Regional Transportation Plan, Metro, Round 3 – April 16, 1999, Strategic Auto Funding scenario.*

An estimate was made for the employment associated with each of these land development categories as a means of comparing it with other communities in the Metro region. The conversion from building area to employment was done using data developed by Metro in their 1990 employment density surveys for office, commercial and industrial uses. The school administrative staff employment projections were based on similar facilities in the Beaverton School District. For details of the conversion, refer to the attached Table A.

Table 3: Concept Plan Area Land Development (Preferred Alternative)

<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan Quantity</i>	<i>Households</i>	<i>Estimated Employment (1)</i>
Middle School	750 students		50
Elementary School	1650 students		110
Office/Light Industrial	341,000 s.f.		1,362
Shopping Center	183,000 s.f.		261
Supermarket	105,000 s.f.		155
Quality Restaurant	42,000 s.f.		70
Senior Housing	1,170 units	1,170	
Apartment	2,845 units	2,845	
Single Family Detached	4,544 units	4,544	
Concept Plan Area Total		8,559	2,008

Notes: (1) Refer to the Table A for specific conversion factors applied to each land use category. The estimated total 2,008 employment compares well with the 2,000 employees cited in *South Urban Reserve Concept Plan*, p. 98.

The above land use total for the concept plan area were compared to the amounts allocated for the plan area in the Metro 2020 model as summarized below in Table 4. Overall, the total number of households is about 1,000 units higher, retail employment is essentially the same, but the number of non-retail employees is about 3,100 less. In discussions with Metro staff³, the large difference for non-retail employment was attributed to older data for the urban reserves that pre-dated the most recent city planning efforts for the concept plan. Metro staff suggested that the model allocations should be adjusted to reflect the most current concept plan, and that the difference should be re-allocated within the sub-regional area such that totals for this portion of the county remain unchanged.

Table 4: Comparison of Plan Description to Metro Allocation

<i>Description</i>	<i>Households</i>	<i>Retail Employees</i>	<i>Non-Retail Employees</i>
Concept Plan	8,559	486	1,522
Metro 2020 Allocation (1)	7,551	392	4,644
Difference	1,008	94	-3,122

Note: (1) Metro data for TAZs 244-248 are the net increase between 1994 and 2020 levels. The existing uses in 1994 are deducted in this manner. A portion of the difference can be attributed to planned growth along TV Highway that lies outside of the urban reserve area boundaries and inside TAZ 244. This includes approximately 600 households and 700 non-retail employees.

³ Telephone conversation with Dennis Yee, Metro Data Resources, (503)797-1578 on 4/29/1999.

Comparison of Plan Area to Selected Metro Communities

The evaluation of a large mixed-use project requires a more comprehensive review of travel demand than typical transportation impact studies. It is appropriate to note that no database currently exists from which to draw actual observations and experience of the other similar urban developments. The large scale (1,650 acres) and density (8,500 households) require consideration of the travel activity that will occur within the project bounds as well as traffic added onto the surrounding street system. To provide guidance in this area of the assessment, the review team elected to review other areas of the Portland Metro region to try and bracket both the land use mix and the associated travel activity patterns. In this case, the most significant element to be determined was the internal trip capture or intra-zonal trips.

Five neighborhoods and community centers throughout the Metro region were selected⁴ for comparison purposes to the concept plan area. Specifically, the mix of local jobs and housing within the defined areas were used as a basis for evaluating the percentage of internal trips within the South Hillsboro Plan area. In most cases, development in these comparison areas have reached a mature state and have little, if any, in-fill opportunities or peripheral growth. The exception is the Bethany Area that had substantial remaining growth⁵ along the northern periphery and at the Bethany Town Center commercial area as of 1994.

The 1994 model allocations for these neighborhood areas are shown in Tables 5 and 6 below in the upper sections of each table. The lower section of each table shows the 2020 allocations for the Bethany and the South Hillsboro Area according to the Metro model and the city's concept plan, respectively. Table 6 shows the TAZs included in the neighborhood group, the total number of households, the total number of employees including retail and non-retail categories. Table 6 provides several demographic indicators for each neighborhood to compare the proportion of households served by retail employment, the ratio of total employment to households, and the average size of the TAZs included in the neighborhood definition.

A review was made of Table 6 to identify communities in 1994 that were comparable to the expected development in South Hillsboro in 2020. The first conclusion from the review was that none of the selected areas were close matches. The most extreme case was the Lloyd Center area that was dramatically different in nearly all aspects, especially the very high jobs/housing ratio (8 jobs per household) and the high proportion of local retail uses. Also, the Hollywood and Hawthorne/Belmont areas compared rather poorly with the plan area with significantly higher ratios of jobs to households although overall housing densities were comparable.

⁴ List of candidate areas were developed during a meeting at Washington County on April 2, 1999 that included staff from the City of Hillsboro, Washington County, Metro, Kittelson & Associates and DKS Associates.

⁵ The Bethany Area expects up to 9,600 households, 460 retail employees, and 3,100 non-retail employees by 2020 according to Metro model allocations. The 1994 level represents about two-thirds of the 2020 housing and one-quarter of the 2020 employment.

Table 5: Land Use Allocations for Selected Metro Areas

<i>Community Area</i>	<i>TAZs</i>	<i>Households</i>	<i>Total Employees</i>	<i>Retail Employees</i>	<i>Non-Retail Employees</i>
<i>1994 Model Land Use Allocations</i>					
St. Johns	921-924	6,580	4,879	1,174	3,705
Lloyd Center	847-849,714	2,210	19,637	3,555	16,082
Hawthorne/Belmont	779-780,786-787	4,582	4,243	1,184	3,059
Hollywood	717-718,856	2,715	4,123	890	3,233
Bethany	163-165,168-171, 204-205,207-208	6,402	889	132	756
<i>2020 Model Land Use Allocations</i>					
Bethany		9,607	3,582	460	3,122
S. Hillsboro Plan Area	244-248 (1)	7,551	5,036	392	4,644
S. Hillsboro Plan Area	Per city plan	8,559	2,008	486	1,522

Notes:

(1) These values are the net change between 1994 and 2020 land use in the selected TAZs.

Table 6: Comparative Demographic Ratios for Selected Metro Areas

<i>Community Area</i>	<i>Total Gross Acres</i>	<i>Ratio of HH/Retail Employees</i>	<i>Ratio of Jobs/HH</i>	<i>Average Households Per Acre</i>	<i>Average Acres Per TAZ</i>
<i>1994 Model Land Use Allocations</i>					
St. Johns	2,406	6	0.7	2.7	602
Lloyd Center	447	1	8.9	4.9	112
Hawthorne/Belmont	567	4	0.9	8.1	142
Hollywood	469	3	1.5	5.8	156
Bethany	3,102	48	0.1	2.1	282
<i>2020 Model Land Use Allocations</i>					
Bethany	3,102	21	0.4	3.1	282
S. Hillsboro Plan Area (Metro)	1,450	18	0.6	5.5	363
S. Hillsboro Plan Area (City)	1,450	18	0.2	5.9	363

The remaining two communities, St. John's and Bethany, appears to have sufficient similarity to the South Hillsboro area to guide how travel activity might occur. The St. John's area has higher ratios of jobs to housing and larger average TAZs that contribute to more local trips because of the gravity-model trip distribution. The St. John's area was selected as an upper limit for internal trip percentage comparison with the plan area.

The other community is the Bethany area that has comparable jobs/housing ratio for total employment and a lower ratio of houses with local retail employment in 1994. By 2020, the higher growth in employment relative to housing in Bethany makes this area the most comparable of all the communities surveyed. This is true despite the fact that housing density in Bethany is about half the level expected in South Hillsboro. The Bethany area was selected as the lower limit for comparison with the 2020 Bethany area as the most likely target for internal trip activity.

Expected Travel Activity

The trip generation estimates for the plan area were developed using Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) data⁶ and the results were compared to the Metro trip forecasts for the same community areas that were used in the previous section.

Trip Generation Methodology

The trip generation analysis was based on accepted traffic engineering principles. Given the size, density, design, amount of mixed-use and location of the study area, there limited empirical evidence regarding how such a development would differ from standard ITE trip generation rates. In some cases, this analysis may overestimate the trip generation from the site (for example, the impact of design on vehicle trip generation). In other cases, trip generation may be underestimated (for example, there is some evidence that per capita vehicle trip generation grows over time - the analysis uses 1997 trip generation rates and assumes they stay constant out to 2020.) The vehicle trip generation was determined based on individual land uses for the concept plan shown previously in Table 3.

The total vehicle trips were reduced to account for pass-by trips at the retail uses per ITE recommendations, then further reduced for potential internal vehicle trips that start and end on site. The internal trip activity assumed in the city's concept plan was 30% of all trips during the p.m. peak hour⁷. This is a very significant assumption as it relates to impact assessment, and it was reviewed critically by comparing it with the Metro model forecasts and by a separate internal trip capture method developed by ITE for mixed-use developments.

The first calculation for internal trips was based on Metro forecasts for the comparable communities previously identified. The number of vehicle trips that start or end outside TAZs (internal-external and external-internal trips), and the total vehicle trips that both start and end within the TAZs (internal or intra-zonal trips) were tabulated. A ratio was taken of the total internal trips to the total vehicle trips to calculate the internal trip percentage for each group of TAZs.

The ITE method for evaluating internal trip capture in mixed-use developments⁸ calculates the number of trip origins and destinations for uses on site, and matches up the trip pairs based on surveys conducted at other mixed-use sites. This is a useful construct for understanding required balancing of trip activity although the sampling of comparable sites is limited⁹. The results show an overall percentage of internal trips within the mixed-use development. The available survey data for this method did not include school uses. Given that the p.m. peak hour of school activity is primarily staff travel, it was assumed that the internal trip percentage derived for other uses applied equally to the school uses.

⁶ *Trip Generation*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, Sixth Edition, 1997; and *Trip Generation Handbook*, Figure 5.5: Shopping Center Pass-By Trips, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1998.

⁷ *Hillsboro South Urban Reserve Concept Plan: Transportation Element*, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., October 29, 1998, page 16. Assumed internal trip components during the p.m. peak hour included 50% of school trips, other public trips, and office trips, 70% of all retail trips, 20% of social/recreational trips, and another 725 trips that would occur on transit (either bus or commuter rail).

⁸ *Trip Generation User's Guide: Recommended Practice*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1998, Chapter 7: Multi-Use Development, pp. 80-92.

⁹ A greater proportion of retail trips paired with residential trips on-site could substantially increase the overall internal trip capture. The ITE data suggests about 10% of retail trips has origins or destinations from residential uses on site. A higher value of 30% was assumed for the plan area.

Total Trip Generation

The plan area vehicle trip generation was calculated by two methods: the first treated each retail use separately (grocery store, restaurant and shopping center), and the other grouped all of them together into one category for shopping centers. As summarized in Table 7, the total trip generation ranges from 8,904 to 10,292 trips during the p.m. peak hour (see attached *Appendix C* for details). Either calculation method is consistent with standard practice, but the grouped retail method is more appropriate for long-range planning purposes because the specific retail uses may be re-defined as the plan is implemented.

Table 7: Total Vehicle Trip Generation for South Hillsboro Plan Area

<i>Method</i>	<i>Daily Trips</i>	<i>PM In</i>	<i>PM Out</i>	<i>PM Total</i>
Separate Retail Uses	96,367	6,062	4,230	10,292
Grouped Retail Uses	87,281	5,254	3,649	8,904

The totals in Table 7 include all vehicle trips including pass-by trips to the retail uses and internal trips that start and end within the South Hillsboro plan area. In the next two sections, these later components are estimated and deducted from the total trips to identify net new vehicle trips off-site of the plan area.

Retail Pass-By Trips

The retail pass-by trips that will be attracted to the plan area are proportional to the total building area of the retail uses (330,000 square feet). These pass-by trips would already be on the transportation system with or without the proposed development, and should be deducted from the site trip generation. According to ITE *Trip Generation* data, the retail pass-by trips for this size of development may be up to 30% of the p.m. peak hour total. For the above case, there will be 414 pass-by trips of the total 1,381 retail trips.

Internal Trips

The Metro model internal trip data compiled for the five selected areas showed a range from 2 to 16 percent internal trips (see Table 9). The highest internal trip rate was in St. Johns while the lowest was in Hollywood and the Hawthorne/Belmont areas. Referring back to Table 6, each of these areas have a relatively good mix of jobs/housing and yet the Metro model intra-zonal trip rates vary significantly. It appears that the average size of the TAZ is a factor in the determination of intra-zonal trips (see number of acres per TAZ in table). The Bethany area showed 7 percent internal trips in 1994 and 6 percent in 2020.

The ITE internal trip capture calculation was made for the South Hillsboro Plan Area (see attached Tables C1). It was found that the internal trip capture ranged was 8 percent assuming the default origin-destination values presented by ITE. As stated previously, this calculation is based on ITE sampled data for mixed-use developments, and these parameters may not directly transfer to the case under study. If the retail-residential component is increased from 10 percent to 30 percent, the overall trip capture increases to 11 percent.

Given the above findings from the ITE method of internal trip calculation and the Metro model analysis, the most reasonable internal trip rate for the South Hillsboro Plan Area is between 6 (Bethany) and 16 percent (St. Johns). Recognizing the limitations of the ITE data set for internal trip calculation, a rate of 11 percent was selected for this study.

Net Added Vehicle Trips

The vehicle trips that will be added to the adjoining street system was calculated by subtracting the retail pass-by trips and internal trips from the total site trips. The results are summarized below in Table 8. The total off-site vehicle trips added by the South Hillsboro Plan Area during the p.m. peak hour is 7,500 vehicle trips.

Table 8: Net Vehicle Trips Off-Site for South Hillsboro Plan Area

<i>Method</i>	<i>Daily Trips</i>	<i>PM In</i>	<i>PM Out</i>	<i>PM Total</i>
Total Vehicle Trips	87,281	5,254	3,649	8,904
Less Retail Pass-By Trips (30%)		-199	-215	-414
Less Internal Trips (11%)		-578	-401	-979
Net Vehicle Trips Generated		4,477	3,033	7,510

The vehicle trip totals for the South Hillsboro Area and the other selected Metro areas used in this study are summarized in Table 10 on the following page. The 1994 trip totals for the other selected Metro areas are shown at the top of the table. More importantly, the South Hillsboro plan area trip totals are listed as determined by the Metro model for the 1-hour and 2-hour periods, along with three trip totals done using ITE methods.

The most striking finding is that the 1-hour Metro trip volumes for South Hillsboro is 7,402 (7,874 less 472 intra-zonal trips is 7,402 trips entering or leaving the plan area), and it is nearly identical to the 7,510 net added trips expected in 1-hour per the ITE method (Selected for Study). Despite the differences noted previously as to land use and internal trip capture, the net vehicle trips added street system in the peak 1-hour are essentially the same using both methods for the plan area. Another finding is that the ratio of plan area 1-hour trip totals (7,874) to the 2-hour trip totals (15,143) per the Metro model is 52 percent. If both hours of the 2-hour period were the same, the ratio would be 50 percent. Therefore, the site will have very similar hourly volumes during the 1st peak hour as the 2nd peak hour in the afternoon. This implies that the site peaking pattern is very flat between the two hours and that the system conditions on-site will be comparable throughout the 2-hour peak period.

Table 9: Vehicle Trip Summary for Selected Metro Areas

<i>Community Area/ Analysis Year and Peak Period</i>	<i>TAZs</i>	<i>Internal- External</i>	<i>External- Internal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Intra-Zonal (1)</i>	<i>% Intra-Zonal of Total Trips</i>
1994 PM 2-Hour Vehicle Trips (Metro model)						
St. Johns	921-924	6,046	7,465	13,511	2,171	16%
Lloyd Center	847-849,714	16,102	11,566	27,668	1,779	6%
Hawthorne/Belmont	779-780,786-787	4,605	4,984	9,589	328	3%
Hollywood	717-718,856	3,548	3,379	6,927	154	2%
Bethany	163-165,168-171, 204-205,207-208	3,820	6,844	10,664	746	7%
2020 PM 2-Hour Vehicle Trips (Metro model)						
Bethany	Same as above	6,459	10,216	16,675	946	6%
S. Hillsboro Plan Area	244-248	6,585	8,558	15,143	909	6%
2020 PM 1-Hour Vehicle Trips (Metro model)						
S. Hillsboro Plan Area	244-248	3,417	4,457	7,874	472	6%
2020 PM 1-Hour Vehicle Trips (per ITE methods) (2)						
S. Hillsboro Plan Area		3,649	5,254	8,903	979	11%

Notes:

(1) Intra-zonal trips are INCLUDED in the for internal-external, external-internal and total trips. Intra-zonal trip includes all trip pairs between zones within the study area.

(2) ITE trip totals do not include pass-by trips associated with retail activities.

Adopted Model Refinements

1. The study area TAZs were divided to better match up with the on-site street system and the Plan Area boundaries. This should be done prior to making new travel demand forecasts for the purpose of impact assessment. The current four TAZs were subdivided so as to retain the current boundaries and form up nine total TAZs for the plan area.
2. A link was added in the network to extend Blanton Street westerly to the southerly extension of Cornelius Pass Road. No other modifications to the existing street system on-site or off-site are required within the general study area.
3. The vehicle trip totals in the study area (TAZs 244-248) for the 2-hour Metro model were factored to match the estimates determined using the ITE methods. This adjustment will effectively correct for differences in land use within the concept plan area.
4. The Metro 2-hour volumes were be adjusted to reflect the higher internal trip capture rate determined in this analysis. The ratio between the Metro 1-hour and 2-hour trip totals was found to be 1.92. To estimate the equivalent trip totals for the study area using the ITE methods, the 1-hour totals were multiplied by 1.92. A summary of the trip recommendation for the South Hillsboro Plan Area is shown below in Table 10.

Table 10: Vehicle Trip Generation Summary for South Hillsboro Area

<i>Description</i>	<i>Internal- External</i>	<i>External- Internal</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Intra- Zonal (1)</i>	<i>% Intra- Zonal</i>	<i>Total Trips Off- Site</i>
Metro 2-Hour Strategic Model	6,585	8,558	15,143	909	6%	14,234
Metro 1-Hour Strategic Model	3,417	4,457	7,874	472	6%	7,402
ITE 1-Hour Estimate	3,649	5,254	8,903	979	11%	7,924
2-Hour Vehicle Trips (2) <i>Recommended for Study</i>	7,019	10,104	17,123	1,880	11%	15,243
Notes:						
(1) Intra-Zonal trips included in totals for Internal-External and External-Internal trips						
(2) ITE 1-hour trip estimates factored by 1.92 to determine 2-hour trip totals. The 1.92 is the ratio of the Metro 2-hour total divided by the Metro 1-hour total.						

Future System Performance Assessment

Applying the adopted model refinements noted in the previous chapter, new 2020 travel forecasts were prepared. The forecasted traffic volumes were evaluated to determine the change in system performance with South Hillsboro Urban Reserves Area development.

2020 Travel Demand Forecasts

Travel forecasts for year 2020 were prepared by DKS Associates with the Existing Resources network and the Strategic Auto network. Separate travel forecasts were made with and without the proposed plan development. The Existing Resources network has significantly less system capacity improvements of the two networks. It represents improvements that are expected with no changes to the current funding programs that are available today. The Strategic Auto network includes substantial improvements that require resources above and beyond current funding levels. The most significant improvement in the South Hillsboro Plan Area are major capacity enhancements to TV Highway between Brookwood Avenue and Murray Boulevard.

Trip Distribution

The project area traffic was isolated for both street network scenarios to determine the trip distribution calculated by the Metro model. This was done using a "select link" analysis for the centroid connectors to the study area TAZs. The results were compiled for major travel corridors in the study area, and for four screen lines located at the perimeter of the plan area. The project trip distribution is presented below in Table 11 and the detailed listing for major travel corridors is summarized in Table 12.

Table 11: Percent of Site Traffic Crossing Selected Screen Lines

<i>Screen Line</i>	<i>Boundary</i>	<i>Existing Resources Network</i>	<i>Strategic Auto Network</i>
A-A	East of 185 th Avenue	36%	38%
B-B	North of TV Highway	36%	38%
C-C	South of Farmington	8%	6%
D-D	West of Brookwood	20%	18%
Total		100%	100%

Overall, the project trip distribution is evenly balanced north and the east of the site. The external origins and destinations north and east of the site ranges from 36 to 38 percent for the two road network. The distribution to and from the west ranges from 18 to 20 percent.

The southern trip distribution is relatively minor, from 6 to 8 percent of the total off-site trips. However, the roadways south of the site are largely rural facilities, and less well suited to service the increased traffic volumes than urban facilities.

For specific road facilities (see Table 12) it was found that the distribution was generally the same for both street networks. The exception was for improved portions of TV Highway that had a higher percentage of project traffic with Strategic Auto improvements (up to 28%) relative to the Existing Resources network (15%). However, the overall east-west travel demand was very similar between the two networks. A careful review of the two select link plots showed that for the Existing Resources network, the portion of site traffic that could not be served by TV Highway was assigned to parallel facilities. The most impacted facilities included Blanton Street, Kinnaman Street, Alexander Street, and Millikan Way.

Table 12: Off-Site Project Trip Distribution on Selected Road Facilities

Street	Segment	Project 2-Hour Volume		Percent of Total Off-Site Project Vehicle Trips	
		Ex. Res.	Strategic	Ex. Res.	Strategic
Farmington Road	w/o River Road	64	65	0.6%	0.6%
	w/o 209th Avenue	165	165	1.5%	1.4%
	w/o 185th Avenue	81	104	0.8%	0.9%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	392	96	3.7%	0.8%
TV Highway	w/o River Road	882	1,039	8.2%	8.9%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	1,706	1,501	15.9%	12.9%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	1,532	2,678	14.3%	23.0%
	w/o 185th Avenue	1,593	3,116	14.9%	26.8%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	1,297	2,609	12.1%	22.4%
	w/o Cedar Hills	1,175	1,805	11.0%	15.5%
Baseline Road	w/o Cornell Road	20	63	0.2%	0.5%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	59	107	0.6%	0.9%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	205	143	1.9%	1.2%
	w/o 185th Avenue	64	133	0.6%	1.1%
Cornell Road	w/o Brookwood Avenue	11	11	0.1%	0.1%
	w/o Shute Road	58	58	0.5%	0.5%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	270	46	2.5%	0.4%
	w/o 185th Avenue	52	54	0.5%	0.5%
185th Avenue	n/o Farmington Road	217	42	2.0%	0.4%
	n/o TV Highway	73	729	0.7%	6.3%
	s/o Baseline Road	835	638	7.8%	5.5%
	n/o Walker Road	202	261	1.9%	2.2%
Cornelius Pass Road	n/o TV Highway	1,675	2,209	15.6%	19.0%
	n/o Baseline Road	771	1,234	7.2%	10.6%
	n/o Cornell Road	505	576	4.7%	4.9%
Century Boulevard	n/o TV Highway	778	932	7.3%	8.0%
	n/o Baseline Road	635	458	5.9%	3.9%
Brookwood Avenue	n/o TV Highway	842	835	7.9%	7.2%
	n/o Baseline Road	438	480	4.1%	4.1%
	n/o Cornell Road	337	314	3.1%	2.7%

Two-Hour 2020 Travel Forecasts

The 2020 travel forecast EMME/2 plots are attached in *Appendix D* for the following cases:

- Existing Resources Network with Project
- Existing Resources Network without Project
- Strategic Auto Network with Project
- Strategic Auto Network without Project

The volume plots show the assigned 2-hour volumes for all roadways within the greater study area. The color of the links reflects the resulting ratio of assigned volume to road capacity (v/c ratio). The legend on the plots show that if less than 80% of the capacity is used, the link color is black. Between 80 to 90%, the link color is green and from 90 to 100% it is blue. Over 100% the link is red. This reflects facilities where the expected demand exceeds capacity for the two-hour period. In addition to the volume plots is a network plot showing the assumed link capacities and speeds for each case.

The 2020 volumes for selected regional roadways are summarized below in Tables 13 and 14 for both networks. The leftmost columns indicate the percentage of project traffic from the urban reserve areas (see Table 13) relative to the forecasted total traffic volumes. The facilities with the project-added traffic over ten percent include TV Highway, Cornelius Pass Road, and Century Boulevard. Another comparison was made with the project-added traffic to the future background traffic (see Table 14). This calculation shows the change volume relative to the expected future volume that would occur without the urban reserve development.

Table 13: Site Traffic Volumes Impacts Relative to 2020 Total Traffic

Street	Segment	Total 2-Hour Traffic Volume		Project Traffic As A Percent of Total Traffic	
		Ex. Res.	Strategic	Ex. Res.	Strategic
Farmington Road	w/o River Road	2,330	1,806	2.7%	3.6%
	w/o 209th Avenue	2,554	2,222	6.5%	7.4%
	w/o 185th Avenue	3,329	3,441	2.4%	3.0%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	7,849	6,651	5.0%	1.4%
TV Highway	w/o River Road	7,270	7,000	12.1%	14.8%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	7,837	7,898	21.8%	19.0%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	8,685	11,548	17.6%	23.2%
	w/o 185th Avenue	9,799	12,859	16.3%	24.2%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	9,890	13,961	13.1%	18.7%
	w/o Cedar Hills	10,957	13,561	10.7%	13.3%
Baseline Road	w/o Cornell Road	1,320	1,346	1.5%	4.7%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	3,483	3,430	1.7%	3.1%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	3,755	2,304	5.5%	6.2%
	w/o 185th Avenue	4,708	4,560	1.4%	2.9%
Cornell Road	w/o Brookwood Avenue	6,112	6,311	0.2%	0.2%
	w/o Shute Road	5,828	4,800	1.0%	1.2%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	9,479	7,637	2.8%	0.6%
	w/o 185th Avenue	7,742	6,526	0.7%	0.8%
185th Avenue	n/o Farmington Road	2,253	1,417	9.6%	3.0%
	n/o TV Highway	5,461	5,386	1.3%	13.5%
	s/o Baseline Road	7,359	5,976	11.3%	10.7%
	n/o Walker Road	8,940	8,277	2.3%	3.2%
Cornelius Pass Road	n/o TV Highway	4,206	6,247	39.8%	35.4%
	n/o Baseline Road	2,607	4,168	29.6%	29.6%
	n/o Cornell Road	6,534	6,052	7.7%	9.5%
Century Boulevard	n/o TV Highway	2,249	3,329	34.6%	28.0%
	n/o Baseline Road	4,047	3,482	15.7%	13.2%
Brookwood Avenue	n/o TV Highway	2,437	2,869	34.6%	29.1%
	n/o Baseline Road	3,782	3,028	11.6%	15.9%
	n/o Cornell Road	3,987	3,732	8.5%	8.4%

Table 14: 2020 Site Traffic Volumes Relative to 2020 Background Volumes

Street	Segment	Total 2-Hour Background Traffic Volume(No Project) Project Traffic As A Percent of Total Background Traffic			
		Ex. Res.	Strategic	Ex. Res.	Strategic
Farmington Road	w/o River Road	2,266	1,741	2.8%	3.7%
	w/o 209th Avenue	2,389	2,057	6.9%	8.0%
	w/o 185th Avenue	3,248	3,337	2.5%	3.1%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	7,457	6,555	5.3%	1.5%
TV Highway	w/o River Road	6,388	5,961	13.8%	17.4%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	6,131	6,397	27.8%	23.5%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	7,153	8,870	21.4%	30.2%
	w/o 185th Avenue	8,206	9,743	19.4%	32.0%
	w/o Murray Boulevard	8,593	11,352	15.1%	23.0%
	w/o Cedar Hills	9,782	11,756	12.0%	15.4%
Baseline Road	w/o Cornell Road	1,300	1,283	1.5%	4.9%
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	3,424	3,323	1.7%	3.2%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	3,550	2,161	5.8%	6.6%
	w/o 185th Avenue	4,644	4,427	1.4%	3.0%
Cornell Road	w/o Brookwood Avenue	6,101	6,300	0.2%	0.2%
	w/o Shute Road	5,770	4,742	1.0%	1.2%
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	9,209	7,591	2.9%	0.6%
	w/o 185th Avenue	7,690	6,472	0.7%	0.8%
185th Avenue	n/o Farmington Road	2,036	1,375	10.7%	3.1%
	n/o TV Highway	5,388	4,657	1.4%	15.7%
	s/o Baseline Road	6,524	5,338	12.8%	12.0%
	n/o Walker Road	8,738	8,016	2.3%	3.3%
Cornelius Pass Road	n/o TV Highway	2,531	4,038	66.2%	54.7%
	n/o Baseline Road	1,836	2,934	42.0%	42.1%
	n/o Cornell Road	6,029	5,476	8.4%	10.5%
Century Boulevard	n/o TV Highway	1,471	2,397	52.9%	38.9%
	n/o Baseline Road	3,412	3,024	18.6%	15.1%
Brookwood Avenue	n/o TV Highway	1,595	2,034	52.8%	41.1%
	n/o Baseline Road	3,344	2,548	13.1%	18.8%
	n/o Cornell Road	3,650	3,418	9.2%	9.2%

System Impact Analysis

A system level impact analysis was done by tabulating the forecasted peak period conditions based on the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio. The results are summarized below in Table 15. All of the facilities listed in Table 15 are designated regional facilities by Washington County and Metro. According to pending Metro guidelines, the minimum acceptable performance standard is Level of Service F for the first hour, and Level of Service E for the second hour during the peak travel period. Any road segment that is shown to be at Level of Service F for the two-hour period, as represented by a v/c ratio > 1.00, is unacceptable by these standards. Therefore, the most significant impacts are the cases where the project added traffic causes a road facility to cross from acceptable to unacceptable. These locations are noted in the following narrative.

Impact Findings

- The majority of arterial road segments sampled in the Existing Resources network (17 out of 32 links) will reach unacceptable levels (v/c ratio greater than 1.00). This occurs with or without the added SHUR project traffic.
- None of the sampled road segments will be significantly impacted, as defined in this study, under the Existing Resources network. In other words, the addition of project traffic does not cause any of the sampled arterial street links to drop from acceptable to unacceptable conditions.
- However, since the majority of links are forecast to exceed capacity, it is difficult to determine the magnitude of the possible impacts of added project traffic on the Existing Resources Network.
- The Strategic Auto Network generally performs very well in the study area without the project-added traffic. A total of six road segment will exceed capacity. These occurs on:
 - Farmington Road west of 170th Avenue
 - Farmington Road west of Murray Boulevard
 - Baseline Road west of 185th Avenue
 - 185th Avenue south of TV Highway
 - Cornelius Pass Road north of Cornell Road
 - Century Boulevard north of Baseline Road
- Major impacts of the project on the Strategic Auto Network are noted at the following locations where the added project traffic degrades conditions from acceptable to unacceptable (v/c ratio > 1.00):
 - TV Highway west of Brookwood Avenue
 - 185th Avenue north of Baseline Road
 - Century Boulevard north of TV Highway
- The TV Highway capacity improvements in the Strategic Auto Network attracts more vehicles to the corridor because of significant reductions in peak hour travel time. In addition, the TV Highway improvement help to relieve parallel east-west facilities.

A technical comparison of the study assumptions and findings relative to the city's SHUR plan efforts is attached in Appendix E.

Table 15: 2020 Roadway Link Impact Analysis

Street	Segment	Existing Resources Network		Strategic Network	
		No Project	With Project	No Project	With Project
Farmington Road	w/o River Road	○	□	○	○
	w/o 209th Avenue	■	■	□	□
	w/o 185th Avenue	◆◆	◆◆	□	□
	w/o 170th Avenue	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
	w/o Murray Boulevard	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
TV Highway	w/o River Road	□	■	□	■
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	□	■	■	◆◆
	w/o Century Boulevard	◆◆	◆◆	○	□
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	◆◆	◆◆	○	○
	w/o 185th Avenue	◆◆	◆◆	○	○
	w/o Murray Boulevard	◆◆	◆◆	○	□
Baseline Road	w/o Cornell Road	□	□	○	○
	w/o Brookwood Avenue	□	■	□	□
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	□	■	○	○
	w/o 185th Avenue	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
Cornell Road	w/o Brookwood Avenue	□	■	□	□
	w/o Shute Road	□	□	○	○
	w/o Cornelius Pass Road	◆◆	◆◆	○	□
	w/o 185th Avenue	◆◆	◆◆	■	■
185th Avenue	n/o Farmington Road	◆◆	◆◆	□	□
	s/o TV Highway	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
	n/o TV Highway	○	○	○	○
	n/o Baseline Road	◆◆	◆◆	■	◆◆
	n/o Walker Road	◆◆	◆◆	■	■
Cornelius Pass Road	n/o TV Highway	○	■	□	■
	n/o Baseline Road	◆◆	◆◆	■	■
	n/o Cornell Road	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
Century Boulevard	n/o TV Highway	■	■	■	◆◆
	n/o Baseline Road	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆	◆◆
Brookwood Avenue	n/o TV Highway	■	■	○	■
	n/o Baseline Road	■	■	□	■
	n/o Cornell Road	□	□	○	○
<i>Legend</i>					
Volume to Capacity Ratio		Symbol			
< 0.80		○			
0.80 to 0.90		□			
0.90 to 1.00		■			
> 1.00		◆◆			